

The Impact of Integrative L₂ Grammar Teaching by Exploration, Explanation, and Expression Techniques on Students' Achievement in Grammar

A thesis

Submitted to the Council of the College of Education Ibn Rushd/ University of Baghdad in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of Master of Education in (Methods of Teaching English)

BY

RAWAA HAFIDH MAJEED AL-AZZAWI

Supervised by

Assistant Professor

FATIN KHAIRI AL - RIFA'I, Ph.D.

2004 A.B.

1425 A.H.

بِسْمِ اللَّهِ الرَّحْمَنِ الرَّحِيمِ

يَرْفَعِ اللَّهُ الَّذِينَ آمَنُوا مِنْكُمْ وَالَّذِينَ

أُوتُوا الْعِلْمَ دَرَجَاتٍ وَاللَّهُ بِمَا

تَعْمَلُونَ خَبِيرٌ

صدق الله العظيم

سورة المجادلة "من آية ١١"

*To the memory of my late parents,
God Bless their souls.*

*To my faithful husband, and my
lovely children.*

Rawaa

I certify that this thesis has been prepared under my supervision at the University of Baghdad as a partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master in Education (Methods of Teaching English).

Signature:

Supervisor: Assist. Prof.

Fatin Khairi Al – Rifa'I, Ph., D.

Date: 17/10/2004

In view of the available recommendations, I forward this thesis for debate by the examining committee.

Signature:

Name: Prof. Abdulla H . Al- Mussawi , Ph.D.

Head of the Department of Educational and Psychological Sciences

Date: 17/10/2004

I certify that I have read the thesis entitled "**The Impact of Integrative L₂ Grammar Teaching by Exploration, Explanation, and Expression Techniques on Students' Achievement in Grammar**" submitted by **Rawaa Hafidh Majid AL-Azzawi** to the Council of the College of Education /IBn Rushed/ University of Baghdad, in partial fulfillment of requirements for the Degree of Master of Education in Methods of Teaching English and it is found Linguistically adequate.

Professor
Sabah AL- Rawi Ph.D
College of Languages
6 /10 /2004

I certify that I have read the thesis entitled "**The Impact of Integrative L₂ Grammar Teaching by Exploration, Explanation, and Expression Techniques on Students' Achievement in Grammar**" submitted by **Rawaa Hafidh Majid AL-Azzawi** to the Council of the College of Education /IBn Rushed/University of Baghdad, in partial fulfillment of requirements for the Degree of Master of Education in Methods of Teaching English and it is found Scientifically adequate.

Assistant Prof.
Munthir M. Al- Dulaimi Ph.D
College of Languages

Examining Committee Certification

We certify that we have read this thesis entitled by "**The Impact of Integrative L₂ Grammar Teaching by Exploration, Explanation, and Expression Techniques on Students' Achievement in Grammar**" by **Rawaa Hafidh Majeed Al - Azzawi**, and as an examining committee examined the student in its content and that, in our opinion, it is adequate as a thesis for the degree of Master in Education (Methods of teaching English).

Signature:
Name:
Member

Signature:
Name:
Member

Signature:
Name:
Chairman
Date:

Approved by the Council of the College of Education.

Signature:
Name: Prof. Abdal – Ameer Abd Dixon Ph., D.
Dean of the College of Education/ Ibn Rushd
Date:

أثر التدريس الترابطي قواعد اللغة
الانكليزية باستعمال اساليب
الاستكشاف والتفسير والتعبير في
تحصيل الطلبة في مادة النحو باللغة
الانكليزية

ملخص رسالة مقدمة الى

مجلس كلية التربية / ابن رشد جامعة بغداد وهي جزء من
متطلبات نيل درجة الماجستير في طرائق تدريس اللغة الإنكليزية

من

رواء حافظ مجيد العزاوي

بإشراف الاستاذ المساعد

الدكتورة

فاتن خيري محمد سعيد الرفاعي

۵۱۴۲۵

۳۰۰۴

الخلاصة

تدرس اللغة الانكليزية في العراق لغة اجنبية بطريقة السمعى اللسانى منذ ١٩٧٠، ومع ذلك فإن تحصيل الطلبة دون المستوى المطلوب. تامل الباحثة بتغيير طريقة التدريس لتحسين النتائج، لذا فقد قامت بتدريس قواعد اللغة الانكليزية بطريقة مترابطة والمعروفة باستخدام اساليب الاستكشاف والتفسير والتعبير (الـ EEE).

هذه الدراسة تهدف الى :

- ايضاح اثر استخدام الطريقة المترابطة في تدريس قواعد اللغة الانكليزية في

تحصيل طلبة الصف الخامس الاعدادي باستخدام اساليب EEE.

وتفترض الباحثة النظرية الصفرية التي تدل على أن لا توجد فروق احصائية

بين المجموعة التجريبية التي درست بالطريقة المترابطة والمجموعة الضابطة التي لم

تدرس بالطريقة المقترحة في مادة القواعد.

مبادئ هذه الطريقة مشتقة من خلفية نظرية لها براهين تجريبية معتمدة على

اسس تعليمية في برنامج من ثلاثة اساليب اعدھا (Sysoyev, 1999).

ثم اجريت دراسة على مدى ثمانية اسابيع باتباع تصميم المجموعات المتكافئة ذات الاختبار القبلي - البعدي فقط و ذلك لبلوغ الهدف من الدراسة وللتحقق من صحة الفرضية.

تم اختيار شعبتين من طالبات الصف الخامس الاعدادي الفرع العلمي عشوائيا لتمثيل عينة الدراسة احدهما مجموعة تجريبية واخرى ضابطة وكوفئت المجموعتان بعوامل مستوى التحصيل الدراسي في اللغة الانكليزية في الصف الرابع العام وفي المعرفة السابقة بالمادة الدراسية من حيث درجات الطالبات على الاختبار القبلي والتحصيل الدراسي للاب والام، وتألقت عينة الدراسة من ستين طالبة، ثلاثين طالبة في كل مجموعة.

اقتصر البرنامج التدريسي على تدريس اربع وحدات (من الوحدة الثالثة الى الوحدة السابعة) من كتاب اللغة الانكليزية للصف الخامس الاعدادي.

درّست المجموعة التجريبية قواعد اللغة الانكليزية بالطريقة المترابطة المقترحة بينما درست المجموعة الضابطة بالطريقة السمعية اللسانية السائدة.

بنت الباحثة اختبارا بعديا، وقد استخرج صدقه وثباته كما استخدم تحليل الفقرات ايضاً ثم طبق الاختبار على عينة الدراسة بعد انتهاء مدة التدريس.

اما الوسائل الاحصائية التي استخدمتها الباحثة في اجراءات الدراسة وتحليل النتائج فقد كانت الاختبار التائي لعينتين مستقلتين ، ومربع كاي، والنسبة المئوية ومعادلة الفا - كرونباخ.

تبين نتائج الدراسة بان طالبات المجموعة التجريبية افضل من طالبات المجموعة الضابطة في التحصيل اللغوي في القواعد المقاس بالاختبار البعدي .
تستنتج الباحثة من ذلك بان استخدام الطريقة المترابطة في تدريس قواعد اللغة الانكليزية كلغة اجنبية اعطت نتائج افضل من الطريقة السمعية اللسانية السائدة ضمن حدود هذه الدراسة، وعليه رفضت الفرضية الصفرية، وقبلت الفرضية البديلة التي تنص على، وجود فروق ذات دلالة احصائية بين المجموعة التجريبية التي درست قواعد اللغة الانكليزية بالطريقة المترابطة، والمجموعة الضابطة التي لم تدرس بالطريقة المترابطة.

في نهاية هذا البحث، استنتجت النتائج، ووضعت التوصيات والمقترحات للدراسات المستقبلية.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I'd like to express great thankfulness to my supervisor Assist. Prof. Dr. Fatin Khairi Al-Rifa'i for her invaluable comments, patience and encouragement throughout the writing of this study.

Special gratitude is addressed to the members of the seminar committee, especially Prof. Ayif Habeeb Al-Ani.

My acknowledgement is to be devoted to the jury members for their assistance and useful advice.

Special gratitude goes to Dr. Qussai Al-Samarra'i for his encouragement. Thankfulness and gratitude are due to Dr.Safa' Tariq Habeeb for helping me in the statistical operations.

I am very grateful to Dr. Abdul-Kareem Fadhil and Dr. Dhuha Attallah for assistance.

I owe a great deal to the teaching staff of Al-Nahdha secondary school for girls for the facilities they provided to carry out the experiment.

Special grateful is devoted to Miss. Hind Faruouq Ali my dearest friend and mate.

And last but not most, my gratitude and love are due to my family, specially to my faithful and helpful husband and my sister Baidaa, who offered all possible help without which this work would have been much more difficult.

Rawaa

ABSTRACT

Teaching English as a foreign language in Iraq has been carried on by using the audiolingual approach since 1970, yet the learners' linguistic achievement is still below the required level. Hoping that changing the approach may yield better results, the researcher adopts the integrative teaching method in L₂ Grammar by using the EEE techniques, is the adopted in the present study. Therefore, this study aims at investigating the effect of integrative L₂ Grammar teaching depending on the EEE approach on the students' achievement in English grammar, especially the fifth class in secondary school.

The null hypothesis states that there is no statistically significant difference between the experimental group which is taught by the integrative L₂ grammar based on the EEE approach, and the control one, which is not taught by the proposed approach, on the testees, achievement in grammar.

The principles of this approach have been derived from a theoretical background having theoretical and experimental evidence on the basis of which a teaching programme of three techniques has been prepared depending on Sysoyev's (1999).

An eight-week experiment has been carried out by adopting the Nonrandomized Control – group Pre –post test Design in order to fulfil the aim of the study and to verify the hypothesis.

Two intact fifth year secondary sections were randomly selected to represent the study sample as experimental and control groups. Both groups were equalized in variables of achievement in English in both the fourth secondary year in their previous knowledge of the teaching material, the achievement of their parents, the pre – test for equalizing groups. The study sample consists of sixty subjects; thirty subjects per group.

The teaching material was limited to four units of book

(7) of the New English Course for Iraq. The integrative teaching of L₂ Grammar by using the EEE approach was assigned to the experimental group whereas, the control group was taught by using the conventional audiolingual approach according to two model lesson plans.

The researcher has constructed a post – test and estimated its validity, reliability and item analysis, and then administered this test to both groups at the end of the experiment.

T-test for two independent samples, chi-square, percentage and Alpha-Cronbach formulas were used throughout the procedures and results analysis.

The findings of the study show that the subjects of the experimental group were better than those of the control one in their achievement in grammar as measured by the post – test.

It is concluded that using the EEE approach in teaching L₂ Grammar yield better results in the linguistic achievement for Iraqi fifth secondary learners than using the conventional audiolingual approach at least in the circumstances involved in the application of this approach for this particular study. Thus, the null hypothesis was rejected and the alternative hypothesis was accepted which is "there is a statistical significant differences between the experimental group which is taught by the proposed approach and the control group which is not taught by the proposed approach".

At the end of this research, the researcher was concluded the conclusions and put the recommendations, suggestions for future studies.

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

| | | |
|----------------|---|--|
| ALA | : | Audiolingual Approach |
| CLT | : | Communicative Language Teaching |
| EEE | : | Exploration, Explanation, Expression |
| EFL | : | English as a Foreign Language |
| ELT | : | English Language Teaching |
| ESL | : | English as a Second Language |
| FLL | : | Foreign Language Learning |
| IA | : | Integrative Approach |
| L ₂ | : | Second Languages |
| NECI | : | New English Course for Iraq |
| NL | : | Native Language |
| OP | : | Oral Practice |
| SL | : | Second Language |
| TEFL | : | Teaching English as a Foreign Language |
| TL | : | Target Language |
| ZPD | : | Zone of Proximal Development |

LIST OF TABLES

| Item | Table | Page |
|-------------|---|-------------|
| Table 1 | The Experimental Design | 52 |
| Table 2 | The Level of Parents' Education | 54 |
| Table 3 | Chi – Square for the Difference in Mothers' Education Level | 55 |
| Table 4 | Chi – Square for the Difference in Fathers' Education Level | 55 |
| Table 5 | The t- value of the Students' Level of Achievement in the Fourth Secondary School | 56 |
| Table 6 | The t- value of the Students' Previous Knowledge in the Pre – test Level of Significance 0.05 | 57 |
| Table 7 | Table of Specification | 62 |
| Table 8 | Teaching Activities and the Time Allotted for Teaching them | 69 |
| Table 9 | The t – value of the Post – test scores | 77 |

LIST OF Appendices

| Item | Appendix | Page |
|-------------|---|-------------|
| Appendix 1 | A Letter to the Jury Member | 98 |
| Appendix 2 | Subjects Scores in the Final Examination in English in the Fourth Secondary year (2002– 2003) | 99 |
| Appendix 3 | The Level of Father's Education | 100 |
| Appendix 4 | The Level of Mother's Education | 101 |
| Appendix 5 | The Equalization Pre – test | (102-103) |
| Appendix 6 | Subjects scores in the Pre – test | 104 |
| Appendix 7 | A Model Daily Plan Lesson for the Experimental Group | (105-106) |
| Appendix 8 | The Post – test | (107-109) |
| Appendix 9 | Subjects' Scores in the Post - test | 110 |
| Appendix 10 | The difficulty level and the discrimination power of the written post test items | 111 |

LIST OF CONTENTS

| Subject | Page |
|---|-----------------|
| Dedication | v |
| Acknowledgements | (vi- vii) |
| Abstract in English | (viii-ix) |
| List of Abbreviations | x |
| List of Tables | xi |
| List of Appendices | xii |
| List of Contents | (xiii-xvi) |
| Chapter One: Introduction | (1 – 9) |
| 1.1 Statement of the problem of the Study..... | (1 – 3) |
| 1.2 Value of the Study | 3 |
| 1.3 Aim of the Study | 4 |
| 1.4 Hypothesis of the Study | 4 |
| 1.5 Limits of the Study | 4 |
| 1.6 Procedures of the Study | (4 – 5) |
| 1.7 Plan of the Study..... | (5– 6) |
| 1.8 Definition of Basic Terms | (6 – 9) |
| Chapter Two: Theoretical Background & Previous Studies | (10– 50) |
| 2.1 An Introductory Note..... | 10 |
| 2.2 Historical View of Teaching Grammar in English | (11 – 21) |
| 2.3 Grammatical Consciousness – Raising | (21 – 22) |
| 2.4 Systemic Functional Linguistic & Pedagogical Grammars..... | (22 – 25) |
| 2.5 Form & Meaning in English Language | (25 – 27) |
| 2.6 Facilitating the Learners' Choice of Grammatical Forms | (28 – 30) |
| 2.7 Integrative Grammar Teaching | (30 – 32) |

| Subject | Page |
|---|------------------|
| 2.8 Integrative Motivation | (33 – 34) |
| 2.9 Instrumental Motivation | 34 |
| 2.10 Integrative Vs Instrumental Motivation | (34 – 37) |
| 2.11 Grammar & the Communicative Approach..... | (37 – 40) |
| 2.12 Notion/Function Vs Pattern/Sentence..... | (41 – 43) |
| 2.13 Focus on Form in Communicative Context..... | (43 – 44) |
| 2.14 Pedagogical Possibilities & Strategies..... | (44 – 46) |
| 2.15 Previous Studies..... | (46 – 49) |
| 2.15.1 Praphu (Cited by Beretta & Davies, 1985)..... | 46 |
| 2.15.2 Sysoyev (1999) | (46 – 48) |
| 2.15.3 Al – Samarrai (2002) | (48 – 49) |
| 2.16 Discussion of Previous Studies | (49 – 50) |
| Chapter Three: Procedures of the Study | (51 – 75) |
| 3.1 An Introductory Note | (51 – 52) |
| 3.1.1 The Experimental Design | (51 – 52) |
| 3.2 Population and Sample Selection | (52 – 57) |
| 3.2.1 Population | (52 – 53) |
| 3.2.2 Sample | (53 – 57) |
| 3.2.2.1 The Level of the Mothers' Education..... | (54 – 55) |
| 3.2.2.2 The Level of the Father's Education..... | 55 |
| 3.2.2.3 The Subjects' Level of Achievement in English in the Fourth Secondary Year (2002 – 2003) | 56 |
| 3.2.2.4 The Subject's Previous Knowledge in English in the Pre – test | (56 – 57) |
| 3.3 Factors Jeopardizing Internal and External Validity..... | (57 – 60) |
| 3.3.1 Contemporary History..... | 58 |
| 3.3.2 Selection Bias | 58 |

| Subject | Page |
|--|------------------|
| 3.3.3 Experimental Morality | (58-59) |
| 3.3.4 Maturation | 59 |
| 3.3.5 The Classroom Environment | 59 |
| 3.3.6 The Teacher | (59-60) |
| 3.4 The Instrument of the Study..... | (60 –68) |
| 3.4.1 The Instructional Material | (60-61) |
| 3.4.2 Lesson Planning | (61 – 62) |
| 3.4.3 The Post – test | (62 – 68) |
| 3.4.3.1 The Validity of the Post – test..... | 63 |
| 3.4.3.2 Face Validity | (63 – 64) |
| 3.4.3.3 Rational (or Content) Validation | (64 – 65) |
| 3.4.3.4 The Pilot Administration of the Post – test | 65 |
| 3.4.3.5 Item Analysis | (66 – 67) |
| 3.4.3.6 Reliability of the Post – test | 67 |
| 3.4.3.7 Scoring Scheme of the Post - test | 68 |
| 3.5 Experiment Application | (68 – 73) |
| 3.5.1 The Control Group | 69 |
| 3.5.2 The Experimental Group | (69 – 73) |
| 3.6 The Statistical Tools | (73 – 75) |
| Chapter Four: Analysis and Discussion of Results | (76 –79) |
| 4.1 An Introductory Note | 76 |
| 4.2 Analysis of Results | (76 – 77) |
| 4.3 Discussion of Results | (78 – 79) |
| Chapter Five: Conclusions, Recommendation & Suggestions for further studies | (80 – 83) |
| 5.1 Conclusions | (80 – 81) |
| 5.2 Recommendations | (81 – 83) |
| 5.2.1 The EFL Learner | 81 |

| Subject | Page |
|--|-----------------|
| 5.2.2 The Teacher | 82 |
| 5.2.3 The Material & Textbooks | 83 |
| 5.3 Suggestions for Further Research | 83 |
| Bibliography | (84–97) |
| Appendices | (98-111) |
| Abstract in Arabic | (2 – 4) |

Chapter One

“Introduction”

1.1 Statement of the Problem of the Study

English language consists of four skills. They are listening, speaking, reading and writing. Each skill sheds light and focuses on different elements of language. One of those elements is grammar.

Ur (1988: 101) raises the issue of whether or not grammar should be explicitly taught. She argues in favour of explicit teaching on the basis that mastering the individual elements of a language be the i.e., Lexical, phonological or grammatical is a valuable means toward eventual ability in communicating in the language. However, form-focused exercises should progress to meaningful activities which themselves should ultimately give way to tasks where the emphasis is on successful communication.

Al-Mutawa’ and Kailani (1989:69) state that pupils should understand and produce linguistic forms as part of a purposeful activity, not just as an exercise in language practice.

Moreover, Nunan (1991:166) believes that the new approaches, informed by recent advances in linguistic theory

and psycholinguistic research, are quite different from these approaches, which characterize the teaching of grammar in the 1950s and 1960s. In particular, systemic functional linguistics provides a principled way of linking context to text and function to form.

Beginning in 1970s, interest in the teaching of “real-language” has become more and more in the language used in various social and cultural settings. As a result, there has been a rapid shift of research and practice from audiolingual and grammar –translation methods to exploration of communicative tasks, rather than on discrete structures.

However, a review of the research starting from 1970s (Ellis, 1997: 78) shows that communicative L₂ teaching was perceived as a departure from grammar in favour of focusing on meaning only. Comparison of communicative (also referred as meaning based) to form-based (also referred to as structure-based) approaches in L₂ teaching shows that communicative language teaching enables students to perform spontaneously but it does not guarantee linguistic accuracy of utterances. On the other hand, form-based approaches focus on the linguistic and grammatical structure, which makes the language grammatically accurate. But the accuracy is observed in prepared speech only, and students lack the ability to produce spontaneous speech.

In learning L₂ grammar, students face a dilemma. On the one hand, students need to know the rules, as that is what they

are tested on at schools. On the other, with a number of foreign visitors, or living in an L₂ country, there is a good need for communication in L₂. That is why there is a need to look at the ways of combining form and meaning in teaching a foreign language.

The present study investigates the understanding of integrative grammar teaching, combining the form and meaning, and proposes what is called the EEE approach technique i.e. exploration, explanation and expression as a teaching procedure.

As a result, the researcher finds it necessary to study and investigate this problem to find solutions in this respect, and to study the benefit of the EEE approach in teaching integrative grammar for Iraqi students.

1.2 Value of the Study

It is hoped that this study will be of great value for:

- 1- Iraqi EFL students for improving their learning of integrative grammar easily by practicing the proposed EEE approach.
- 2- EFL teachers to adopt the communicative method, especially the proposed approach in teaching integrative grammar.
- 3- Enriching the field of research in teaching English as a foreign language.
- 4- Future researchers in ELT.

1.3 Aim of the Study

This study aims at investigating the effect of integrative L₂ grammar teaching depending on the EEE approach on the students' achievement in English grammar.

1.4 Hypothesis of the Study

The null hypothesis of the study states that there is no statistically significant difference between the experimental group which is taught by the integrative L₂ grammar based on the EEE approach, and the control one, which is not taught by the proposed approach, on the testees' achievement in grammar.

1.5 Limits of the Study

The study is limited to the following:-

- 1- The sample is limited to the day secondary female school students in Baghdad.
- 2- The academic year is 2003-2004.
- 3- EEE means using three techniques in teaching L₂ grammar. i.e., exploration, explanation and expression.

1.6 Procedures of the Study

The procedures adopted for carrying out the aim of the study are as follows:

- 1- Two samples of female students are selected randomly from Iraqi secondary schools. One of them is experimental group and the other is control.
- 2- The two samples are equalized according to several factors.
- 3- The experimental group is exposed to the integrative L₂ grammar based on teaching the EEE approach, whereas the control group is not exposed to it, but taught depending on the traditional approach followed nowadays in Iraqi secondary school, and stated in the teacher's guide (i.e. the audiolingual method).
- 4- The two groups are then exposed to a post test in grammar to find out whether there are differences or not on their achievement, or not.
- 5- Suitable statistical means are used to compute results and draw out the conclusions.

1.7 Plan of the Study

The present study consists of five chapters followed by a bibliography.

Chapter one deals with the statement of the problem and outlines the aims, hypothesis, value, limits as well as the procedures and statistical methods used for obtaining the results and analyzing them.

Chapter two deals with the theoretical background and some previous studies that have investigated Integrative L₂ teaching in

Grammar and in communicative language and its influence on the students' achievement.

Chapter three is devoted to the identification and description of the experimental work and the procedures followed in details. The description takes into consideration the selection of the sample, administration of tests, and the application of the suggested EEE method.

Chapter four gives a comprehensive and accurate analysis of the results with a detailed discussion.

Chapter five includes the conclusions, recommendations, and suggestions for further studies.

1.8 Definition of Basic Terms

The following terms, are defined.

Integrative Approach (IA):

Good (1973:293) defines the IA as “one of the philosophic approaches to generalized truth, representing synthesis, that is, the thoughtful interrelating of findings of many scientific studies in such away as to examine the validity of their conclusions in the light of a larger pattern or theory and at the same time formulate and examine the tenability of a larger pattern of interpretation and make any necessary tentative or hypothetical modification in it”.

Widdowson (1978:144) states that, “The IA is an approach which brings linguistic skills and communicative abilities into close association with each other”.

Similarly, Seasnan (1997:98) believes that IA means “making sure that all the four skills: listening, speaking, reading and writing, are taught so that they support each other in all parts of the concept of integrative English”.

Daniels et al (1999:32) define the IA as “a philosophy of teaching and learning, an approach of closely related activities”.

The researcher adopted seasnan definition as an operational definition for the particular study.

Grammar: It is the science of language, its pronunciation, punctuation, syntax and inflexion (Page et al., 1980:151).

Good (1973:264) defines grammar strictly as the study of the phonology, inflections and syntax of language. Commonly used, it is the part of language study that pertains to the different classes of words, their relations to one another, and their functions in sentences.

The researcher adopts Good's (1973: 264) definition as an operational definition for the particular study.

Teaching: Narrowly, it is the act of instructing in an educational institution. Broadly, it means the management by an instructor of the teaching. Learning situations, including direct interaction between the teacher and the learner, the preactive decision – making process of planning, designing, and preparing the

materials for the teaching learning conditions, and Post – active redirection (evaluation, redesign, and dissemination). (Good, 1973:588).

According to Page et al (1980:338) teaching is the work or occupation of teachers, to impart knowledge or skill to another; to give instruction to another; to educate or to train another; to facilitate learning.

The researcher adopts page's (1980: 338) definition as an operational definition for the particular study.

Exploration: It is the first stage of integrative grammar teaching. This stage is characterized by “inductive learning”. Students are given sentences illustrating a certain grammar rule and are asked as a group to find the pattern and, with the help of the teacher, to formulate the rule. The knowledge they obtain becomes theirs and it is often much easier to remember.

Exploration, then, works as an excellent tool for motivation (sysoyev, 1999 :4)

Explanation: It is the second stage of learning. As students find sequences or patterns in the examples they used during the exploration stage, the teacher or the students can summarize what was previously discovered now focusing on the form (Ibid: 5).

Expression: It is the third and last stage of the process. Students start practicing the production of meaningful utterances with each other in communication and interactive tasks (Ibid: 5).

Technique: It is the procedure used by a teacher in a classroom. It is what the teacher actually does in the classroom to implement a method, which is, in turn consistent with an approach (AL-Mutawa' and Kailani, 1989:12).

In addition, it is a different method, which make use of different kinds of classroom activities (Candlin, et al, 1992:20).

In respect to the present study, technique here refers to each of the proposed expressions used, i.e., EEE. The three of these expressions compose an approach of teaching. Each expression is used later a stage in presenting the practical work of the study.

The researcher defines the term “technique” as the procedure used by the teacher in the classroom.

Achievement: It is defined by Good (1973:7) as “the accomplishment or proficiency of performance in a given skill or body of knowledge”

Dwyer (1982:12) states that achievement refer to “the learning that takes place during a definable course of instruction”.

“Achievement in learning a language refers to how much of a language someone has learned with reference to a particular course or programme of instruction” (Richards et al, 1985:2).

The researcher adopts Good's (1973: 7) definition as an operational definition for this study.

Chapter Two

“ Theoretical Background & Previous Studies”

2.1 An Introductory Note

The concept of “grammar” is viewed differently by various schools of linguistics. According to the traditionalists, it is a collection of rules and principles; while to the structuralists it is the study of how sentences are arranged and formed. The transformationalists consider it as the rules that generate infinite sentences and allow speakers to understand utterances they have never heard of; whereas to some exponents of the communicative approach, it is the functions and notions of language as opposed to structural patterns ” (AL-Mutawa and Kailani, 1989: 69).

This chapter sheds light on the notions of form and meaning, integrative grammar, and communicative language teaching along with several other ideas that are found to be of great relation to this study. There is a survey of related studies at the end of this chapter with their discussion as well.

2.2 Historical View of Teaching Grammar In English

As “modern” language began to enter the curriculum of European schools in the eighteenth century, they were taught using the same basic procedures that were used for teaching Latin. “Textbooks consisted of statements of abstract grammar rules, lists of vocabulary, and sentences for translation. These sentences were constructed to illustrate the grammatical system of the language and consequently bore no relation to the language of real communication” (Richards & Rodgers, 2001:4).

A typical textbook in the mid-nineteenth century thus consisted of chapters or lessons organized around grammar points. Each one-listed rules and its use were explained, and it was illustrated by sample sentences. Nineteenth-century textbook compilers were mainly determined to codify the FL into frozen rules of morphology and syntax to be explained and eventually memorized (Ibid: 5).

According to Kelly, (1969: 53), grammar translation was in fact first known in the United States as the Prussian Method. The goal of FL study is to learn a language in order to read its literature. Grammar – translation is a way of studying a language that approaches the language first through detailed

analysis of its grammar rules, followed by application of this knowledge to the task of translating sentences and text into and out of TL.

Grammar is taught deductively that is, by presentation and study of grammar rules, which are then practiced through translation exercises. A syllabus was followed for the sequencing of grammar points throughout a text, and there was an attempt to teach grammar in an organized and a systematic way (Freeman, 1986: 11-12; and Richards & Rodgers 2001: 6).

Consequently, though it may be true to say that the grammar – translation method is still widely practiced, it has no advocates. It is a method for which there is no theory. There is no that offers a rationale or justification for it or that attempts to relate it to issues in linguistics in psychology, or educational theory (Brown, 1987: 74 and Richards & Rodgers, 1998: 4A).

No attention is paid to practical mastery of the language or how it is actually used. The main concern is linguistic. Thus, students studying classical languages (Latin and Greek) had to spend their time in defining the parts of speech, and in memorizing conjugations, declensions and rules of grammar of these languages. Pupils learning English according to this method have to learn by heart grammatical rules and tables of conjugations, and have to translate with the help of a dictionary (Al-Mutawa and Kailani, 1989: 14).

In the 19th century socio-economic developments and the rise of the middle classes to social and political influence caused new developments in the educational field, too. And the modern languages were counted among the practically useful subjects because of the increasing needs and opportunities for communication among citizens of different countries of Europe.

On the level of teaching methodology, the reformers proposed that the traditional deductive approach, which put the learning of abstract rules and memorizing of tables with conjugations and declensions above and before the use of the TL in class, be replaced by an inductive approach, that the reformers did not propose to ban explicit teaching of grammar from FL classes! knowledge of rules of grammar was still considered indispensable, but it should be gained inductively (Ume, Multh aup, 2002 : p.9).

On the other hand, the German scholar Franks 1884 wrote on the psychological principles of direct association between forms and meanings in the TL and provided a theoretical justification for a monolingual approach to teaching. According to Franks (ibid), a language could best be taught by using it actively in the classroom rather than using analytical procedures that focus on explanation of grammar rules in classroom teaching, teachers must encourage the direct and spontaneous use of the FL in the classroom. Learners would then be able to

induce rules of grammar (Richard & Rodgers, 2001: 11; Brown, 1987: 57).

The direct method was quite successful in private language schools, such as those of Berlitz chain, where paying clients had high motivation and the use of native-speaking teachers was the norm. However, despite pressure from proponents of the method, it was difficult to implement in public secondary school education. It overemphasized and distorted the similarities between naturalistic L₁ learning and classroom FL learning and failed to consider the practical realities of the classroom. In addition, it lacked a rigorous basis in applied linguistic theory, and for this reason it was often criticized by the more academically based proponents of the Reform Movement (Richards & Rodgers, 2001: p.12-13).

A number of well – known authors described in their books the Audio-lingual method what they call the “scientific approach” to FLT. It has its roots in the American approach to the study of languages that developed in the 1930s. Famous representatives of that approach are anthropologists like Franz Boas, Edward Sapir, Benjamin Lee Whorf, the linguist Leonard Bloomfield, and the psychologist B.F. Skinner, who popularized the idea of language learning as habit – formation (conditioned behavior) in his book *Verbal Behavior* (1957), where Skinner combined principles of behavioristic learning psychology with the new branch of linguistics that became known as structural

linguistics. It represented a critical reaction to the philosophical and prescriptive approach to the study of language that had occupied a dominant position in linguistics before that time, but it represented, if viewed in retrospective, a dangerously reduced concept of language that restricted itself to the study of surface forms, ignoring that the roots of language lied in semantics and its social functions.

Structuralist criticized that the traditional approach in linguistics lacked scientific accuracy because it relied on the individual grammarian's intuitive judgments of forms, rather than focusing on an objectives description and classification of the observable language forms. The study of meaning, structuralists argued, could not be considered the job of linguists because as scientists, they argued they had to restrict their methodology to the description and analysis of objective data , that is surface forms (patterns) (Ume Multhaup, 2002: 20).

The AL Approach in FLT is the result of a bending of ideas from structuralism and behaviorism. But the basic criticism to be brought up against the AL Approach is that it led to a mindless and mechanistic reproduction of given language forms and that it did not encourage learners to make a creative use of what they learnt .

The situational approach, like the AL one, emphasized that essential for progress in language learning is the frequent practice of the selected language forms, but it puts the emphasis

on the language used on typical contexts of every day communication that is why course designers tried to find situations of language use that are meaningful with regard to the future situations in which the learners would want to use their English.

Since the first reform movement, teachers therefore underlined the need for a vocabulary and grammar control, combining it with a call for an inductive approach that starts from practical examples instead of abstract rules and categories. The situational approach was one of the first to do this systematically and against the background of a theoretical concept of language that underlined the interdependence of the formal (phonological, lexical, and grammatical) and functional (contextual) level of language (Ibid: 24).

Two of the leaders in this movement were Palmer and Hornby who are two of the most prominent figures in British twentieth century language teaching. They attempted to develop a more scientific foundation for an oral approach to teaching English than was evidenced in the direct method. The result was a systematic study of the principles and procedures that could be applied to the selection and organization of the content of language courses.

Palmer had emphasized the problems of grammar for the foreign learners. He viewed grammar as the underlying sentence patterns of the spoken language. Palmer, Hornby and other

British applied linguists analyzed English and classified its major grammatical structures into sentence patterns (later called “Substitution tables”), which could be used to help internalize the rules of English sentence structure (Richard & Rodgers, 2001: 36-38).

Many British linguists had emphasized the close relationship between the structure of language and the context and situations in which language is used, such as Firth and Halliday, who developed powerful views of language in which meaning, context, and situation were given a prominent place (Halliday et al., 1964:38).

Like the direct method, situational language teaching adopted an inductive approach to the teaching of grammar. The meaning of words or structures was not to be given through explanation in either the NL or the TL but was to be induced from the way the form was used in a situation.

Structural linguistics developed in part as a reaction to traditional grammar. Traditional approaches to the study of language had linked the study of language to philosophy and to a mentalist approach to grammar. Grammar was considered a branch of logic, and the grammatical categories of Indo – European Languages were thought to represent ideal categories in languages (Richards & Rodgers, 2001: 54).

Nevertheless, the contribution of traditional grammar to FLL is considerable. Thus along with its practical definitions of

the parts of speech, it also gave useful definitions of basic structures such as phrases, clauses, and sentences. Furthermore, it provided the teacher with simple “rules” to teach the language. Probably for these reasons, traditional grammar was still used in one form or another in FL classes (Al- Mutawa and Kailani, 1989: 70).

British applied linguists emphasized another fundamental dimension of language that was inadequately addressed in approaches to language teaching at that time – the functional and communicative potential of language. They saw the need to focus in language teaching on communicative proficiency rather than on mere mastery of structures. In 1971, a group of experts began to investigate the possibility of developing language courses on a unit – credit system, a system in which learning tasks were broken down into “portions or units, each of which corresponds to a component of learner’s needs and is systematically related to all other portions” (Van EK and Alexander, 1980: 6).

Wilkins (1972: 50) contribution was an analysis of the communication meaning that a language learner needs to understand and express. Rather than describing the core of language through traditional concepts of grammar and vocabulary, Wilkins (Ibid) attempted to demonstrate the systems of meanings that lay behind the communicative uses of language. He described two types of meanings: notional

categories (concepts such as time, sequence, quantity, location, frequency) and categories of communicative function (requests, denials, offers, complaint) (Richard & Rodgers, 2001: 145).

The communicative approach in language teaching started from a theory of language as communication. The goal of language teaching is to develop what Hymes (1972: 281) referred to as “communicative competence”. For Chomsky, the focus of linguistic theory was to characterize the abstract abilities speakers possess that enable them to produce grammatically correct sentences in a language. Hymes held that such a view of linguistic theory was sterile, that linguistic theory needed to be seen as part of a more general theory incorporating communication and culture. Hymes theory of communicative competence was a definition of what a speaker needs to know in order to be communicatively competent in a speech community.

Another linguistic theory of communication favored in CLT is Halliday’s functional account of language use. Here, “Linguistics ... is concerned ... with the description of speech acts or texts, since only through the study of language in use are all the functions of language, and therefore all components of meaning, brought into focus”. (Halliday, 1970 : 145).

Halliday (1973, 1978), attempted to develop theories of language structures which show how the formal grammatical patterns reflect the functions of language, arguing that language use determines language structure. It is not necessary for this to

be so, for the relationship between language use and grammatical form could be as arbitrary as the relationship between the meaning of a word and the form of the word (pink is not a particularly pink word). Any grammatical structure can be functional categories of linguists like Halliday have no immediate pedagogical use, as currently formulated.

The language teacher thus has a responsibility to provide language structure for learners, as well as responsibility to give them opportunities for using the language (Finocchiaro & Brumfit, 1983: 32-33). They summarized this idea in the following points:

- 1- Teaching is learner-centered and responsive to learners needs and interests.
- 2- The TL is acquired through interactive communicative use that encourages the negotiation of meaning.
- 3- Genuinely meaningful language use is emphasized, along with unpredictability, risk-taking, and choice making.
- 4- There is exposure to examples of authentic language from the TL community.
- 5- The formal properties of language are never treated in isolation from use; language forms are always addressed with in a communicative context.
- 6- Learners are encouraged to discover the forms and structures of language for themselves.

- 7- There is a whole – language approach in which the four traditional language skills (speaking, listening, reading, and writing) are integrated.

At the level of language theory, CLT has a rich, if somewhat eclectic, theoretical bases, some of the characteristics of this communicative view of language are follows:

- 1- Language is a system for the expression of meaning.
- 2- The primary function of language is to allow interaction and communication.
- 3- The structure of language reflects its functional and communicative uses.
- 4- The primary units of language are not merely its grammatical and structural features, but categories of functional and communicative meaning as exemplified in discourse (Richards & Rodgers, 2001: 161)

2.3 Grammatical Consciousness- Raising

Rutherford (1987, 149-210) in building his case for consciousness raising, explicitly rejects the “Traditional” beliefs that language is constructed out of discrete entities and that language learning consists, of the gradual accumulation of these entities. He also rejects the notion that grammatical rules can be directly imparted to the learner through teaching because of the complexity of many rules, and because of the interrelationships between them. For this reason, he sees classroom activities as

being basically inductive rather than deductive. These activities are meant to facilitate the learning process by providing data through which learners may form and test hypotheses, and also by helping learners link the new with they already known.

Nunan and Lockwood (1989) and Rutherford (1987) invite learners, inductively, to develop hypotheses about the target feature of the language (Nunan, 1991: 150).

2.4 Systemic Functional Linguistic and Pedagogical Grammars

This approach argues that language exists in context, and that the context and purposes for which language is used will determine the ways in which language is realised at the level of text and grammar. While there is no one – to – one relationship between form and function; the relationship between the two is not arbitrary when the teacher wants to focus on a particular grammatical item, that item is introduced within a particular context, and learners work from context to text to sentence and clause, rather than from clause/sentence to text. The pedagogical approach derived from this model of linguistics also seeks to show learners how language differs according to the context in which it is produced, the purposes for which it is produced, and the audience to which it is addressed (Nunan, 1991:152).

Wilkins (1976) one of the principal architects of communicative approach to language teaching argues for a

notional syllabus, that is, one in which the basic building blocks are the meanings and concepts expressed through the language, not the grammatical elements. However, he also points out that acquiring the grammatical system is of central importance, because an inadequate knowledge of grammar would severely constrain linguistic creativity and limit the capacity for communication. “A notional syllabus, no less than a grammatical syllabus, must seek to ensure that the grammatical system is properly assimilated by the learner” (Wilkins, 1976: 66).

Swain (1985:50-153) has added empirical weight to this claim, showing that exposure to the target language in meaningful contexts is sufficient for most learners to develop a sophisticated working knowledge of grammar. Such a working knowledge is important because learners' ability to express themselves is constrained by the extent to which they can encode their meanings grammatically.

Mckay (1987: 154-158), in her book on teaching grammar suggests that there are three different views on teaching grammar. The first view is that teaching grammar entails these the formal explanation will end up knowing quite a lot about the language, they will not necessarily be able to put the language to communicative effect. The second view is that teaching grammar is basically a matter of providing learners with practice in mastering common grammatical patterns through a process of

analogy rather than explanation. The learners may become fluent in the structures they have been taught, but may not be able to use them appropriately in genuine communication outside the classroom. The third view is that teaching grammar is a matter of giving students the opportunity to use English in a variety of realistic situations.

Ur (1988: 154-159) advocates fairly a traditional four-stage approach to the teaching of grammar items:

- 1- **Presentation:** It is making the structure salient through an input text in which the item appears.
- 2- **Isolation and explanation:** It is ensuring that students understand the various aspects of the structure under investigation.
- 3- **Practice:** It getting students to absorb and master the language.
- 4- **Test:** It getting learners to demonstrate mastery.

Frank and Rinvolucri (1987: 98) attempt to provide a range of classroom exercises and activities, with intensive practice in a number of basic morphosyntactic items, so within a context which stresses “Communicative” rather than “linguistic” competence, and ability rather than knowledge. Thus, the learner control what is said, while the teacher provides direction on how it is said. “This adds up to total involvement of learner’s whole person, with total responsibility for what he or she produces in a

rather loose framework of predetermined cues” (Frank and Rinvoluçi, 1987: 7; Nunan, 1991:155).

Generally speaking, CLT is associated with a shift from traditional form-oriented to a meaning oriented teaching; correspondingly teachers are expected to help their students learn how to voice their notions and illocations instead of plaguing them with never-ending formal pattern drills; that naturally goes with the slogan that conventional form-and teacher-centred approach should be replaced by a learner centred approach. “say what you mean” instead of “Do as you are told”, as well as “fluency above accuracy “(With correspondingly relaxed view of learners’ linguistic errors) are other slogans that fit into the general concept of CLT.

2.5 Form and Meaning In English Language

A second characteristic of linguistic study of language is that it makes a clear distinction between statements about the use to which we put language (its meaning) and the actual shape which units of language have and the relationship which exists between them (its form). So, some have assumed that whatever language we speak, a universal conceptual system underlies our use of that language. In describing a language, therefore, they have sought to categorize its forms in terms of a universal system, which did not have to be justified each time one made a description.

In contrast, others have believed that far from there being a universal system of grammar, every language should be examined with a minimum of preconceptions and its regularities explained only on the basis of observable evidence.

The predominant view that in studying language one should be concerned primarily with actually occurring forms. One should aim to discover the regularities of the forms themselves, their arrangements and relationships. Such a view was felt almost to be a defining characteristic of linguistic study of language and was commonly believed to be in contrast thereby with more “traditional” attitudes to language (Wilkins, 1972: 15-16).

The origins of this principle lay in the belief that statements about language should be based on evidence that was available to all. Only in this way could linguistic be an objective scientific study. If the linguist starts from pieces of language which he knows have usually occurred, then makes his analysis and predicts on the basis of it, anyone can check the statements he makes against language which is actually produced.

It is sometimes said that a statement is only worth making if it is clear by what means we might attempt to disprove it. The forms of language can be studied in this way.

Meaning, however, is not susceptible to such an approach. The meaning of items of language is compounded of the internal states of both speakers and hearers, of the context, physical and

linguistic, in which the language is produced and received, of the uses to which the recurring items have been put in the past, on the biographical experience of the individuals concerned in the language event, and so on.

It is not surprising that linguists have felt it is impossible to make precise statements about meaning, or that such statements as are made are little more than expressions of opinion and are not particularly valuable since there is no objective way of evaluating them.

It was Bloomfield's ideas on the study of language that eliminated linguistic until 1950s. Bloomfield (1935: 140) would never have said that meaning shouldn't be studied, but for some that followed him semantics was a field outside linguistic science and it was considered somewhat disreputable to be interested in it. Even if not every one went so far, at least it was agreed that considerations of meaning should not be allowed to influence the analysis of language which should be based on the forms alone.

A formal analysis of such words, an analysis of their syntactic functions, will result in their being classified and sub-classified quite differently. Indeed, by far the most important criterion for the establishment of classes of word, phrase, or clause in a language is similarity of function in the structure of a sentence. Nouns are classes of words that typically behave in certain ways (Wilkins, 1972: 17-18).

2.6 Facilitating the Learners' Choice of Grammatical Forms

The second issue evolving from the new place of grammar in ELT, the understanding of which is nowadays meaning and communication – focused, is connected with developing that aspect of grammatical competence which can facilitate the learners' choice of grammatical forms appropriate to a given linguistic and situational context. To help learners make the appropriate choice of grammatical form, more attention to linguistic forms, their meanings and use should be given in communicative classroom curricula.

Here, the researcher means not only defining listing the contexts, in which specific grammatical forms occur, which is current practice and is to be highly recommended, but also making them conscious of general grammatical meanings signalled by grammatical forms, such as “anteriority” by the perfective forms “present time perspective” by present tense forms, “possibility” by modal verbs can/could and may/might, “reference” by articles, etc. It would be helpful for the learner at this point to be aware of the distinction between “contextual meaning: (e.g. defining the use of past simple for future), “general grammatical meaning” which covers all the contextual uses and “interpretive meaning”, which can be completely different from the first two (for example, if the researcher say in

a classroom context, the door is open, it can, in fact, be a request for someone to close the door).

The learners' knowledge of the meanings encoded in specific grammatical forms and their use, as well as their awareness of the differences between various types of meanings, will provide them with a number of possibilities to choose from, facilitate their decisions about what to choose and how to formulate the meanings they want to convey in particular contexts (Murkowska, 2000: 32).

To sum up, implementing “focus-on –form” instruction into communicative teaching requires teachers to include more inductive consciousness – raising tasks in their task-based grammar teaching (especially those which will help their learners discover the meanings encoded in grammatical forms) and also points to subtle meaning distinctions between particular forms.

Furthermore, it encourages learners to intensify their reading and listening skills with particular attention being drawn to the meaning and use of grammatical forms in real communication.

In more general terms, the new role and place of grammar in ELT demand a more autonomous language teacher, whose knowledge-based choices of “if , what and how” to teach grammar depend on the learners' immediate needs. It also requires from teachers a stronger focus on developing the

learners' ability to make more conscious choice of grammatical forms appropriate in a given linguistic and situational context.

This can be facilitated by introducing grammatical consciousness-raising tasks which make meaning and use of grammatical forms more evident to the learners.

2.7 Integrative Grammar Teaching

As a possible solution, integrative grammar teaching combines a form-based with a meaning –based focus. Spada and Lightbown (1993: 205) have also argued “that form-focused instruction and corrective feedback provided within the context of communicative interaction can contribute positively to second language development in both the short and long term”.

Thus, integration of form and meaning is becoming increasingly important in current research (Celce-Murcia et al., 1997: 141-146).call it “a turning point” in CLT, in which “explicit, direct elements are gaining significance in teaching communicative abilities and skills”.

Of course, depending on the students and their particular needs, either form or meaning can be emphasized. But in having various students with different needs in the same group, or having various needs in the same students, an integrative grammar teaching approach creates optimal conditions for learning for everyone in the classroom.

Musumeci (1997, cited in Sysoyev, 1999: 3) mentions the idea of connecting form and meaning in grammar teaching as a developing trend in reference to the proficiency oriented curriculum. She points out that students should be able to learn explicit grammar rules as well as have a chance to practice them in communication in the authentic or simulation tasks.

Interestingly, Musumeci (ibid), thus advocates given students a chance to look at the language on a sentence level to see how certain grammatical rules are applied.

Integrative grammar teaching, which presupposes students' interaction while learning, can be viewed as a cognitive process of learning an L₂ that reflects the sociocultural theory proposed by the Russian psychologist Vygotsky (1978), in talking about the development of a child's brain and his socialization Vygotsky argues that there is a strong relationship between learning and cognitive development, in which cognition develops as a result of social interaction and sharing the responsibility with a parent or a more competent person. From an early age, children look to their parents for clues to acceptable social behavior. This brings us to Vygotsky's zone of proximal development (ZPD) in which there are two main stages of an individual's development. The first stage is what a child or learner can do by himself; the second stage is his potential, what he can accomplish with the help of another, more competent person.

The distance between two points is called the zone of proximal development. Vygotsky also introduces the notion of a mediator—a person who helps students to accomplish what they cannot do by themselves.

According to Appel and Lantolf (1994: 465-83), and Lantolf and Pavlenko (1995: 108-24), the role of the mediator in teaching an L₂ is placed on an L₂ teacher, whose task is to direct students in the right direction and help them reach the second stage in the ZPD.

Similar to Vygotsky's theory is the often – criticized Krashen's (1981, 1985) input Hypothesis, also well – known as the “i + 1” hypothesis. According to this hypothesis “i” represents students' current level of L₂ proficiency, and “+1” is the level of the linguistic form or function beyond the present students' level. Krashen's input Hypothesis and Vygotsk's zone of proximal development are basically describing the same cognitive process of social interaction in student's development. For Krashen, optimal input should be comprehensible, i.e. focused on the meaning and not on the form (Sysoyev, 1999:4).

In this study students will be focusing on the form, but actively through communicative, meaning-based, exploratory assignments.

2.8 Integrative Motivation

Motivation has been identified as the learner's orientation with regard to the goal of learning on SL (Crooke's and Schmidt, 1991: 496-512).

It is thought that students who are most successful when learning a target language are those who like the people that speak the language admire the culture, and have a desire to become familiar with or even integrate into the society in which the language is used (Falk 1978 cited in Jacqueline Norris – Holt, 2001: 6).

This form of motivation is known as integrative motivation. When someone becomes a resident in a new community that uses the TL in its social interactions, integrative motivation is a key component in assisting the learner to develop some level of proficiency in the language.

It becomes a necessity, in order to operate socially in the community and become one of its members. It is also theorized, “Integrative motivation typically underlines successful acquisition of a wide range of registers and a native like pronunciation” (Finegan, 1999: 568).

In an EFL setting, it is important to consider the actual meaning of the term “integrative”. As Benson (1991: 34-48) suggests, a more appropriate approach to the concept of integrative motivation in the EFL context would be the idea that

it represents the desire of the individual to become bilingual, while at the same time becoming bicultural.

2.9 Instrumental Motivation

In contrast to integrative motivation is the form of motivation referred to as instrumental motivation. This is generally characterized by the desire to obtain something practical or concrete from the study of the SL (Hudson 2000 cited in Jacqueline Norris - Holt). With instrumental motivation, the purpose of language acquisition is more utilitarian, such as meeting the requirements for school or university graduation, applying for jobs, etc.

Instrumental motivation is often a characteristic of second language acquisition, where little or no social integration of the learner into a community using the TL takes place, or in some instances is even desired.

2.10 Integrative Vs Instrumental Motivation

While both integrative and instrumental motivation are essential elements of success, it is integrative motivation which has been found to a sustained long-term success when learning an SL (Taylor et al., 1997: 99-118; Crookes and Schmidt, 1991: 469-512) .

In some of the early research conducted by Gardner and Lambert, integrative motivation was viewed as being of more

importance in a formal learning environment than instrumental motivation (Ellis, 1997: cited in Jacqueline Norris - Holt, 2001).

In later studies, integrative motivation is also stressed. However, it is important to note that instrumental motivation has only acknowledged as a significant factor in some research, whereas integrative motivation is continually linked to successful second language acquisition.

It has been found that students generally select instrumental reasons more frequently than integrative reasons for the study of language. Those who do support an integrative approach to language study are usually more highly motivated and overall more successful in language learning. One area where instrumental motivation can prove to be successful is in the situation where the learner is provided with no opportunity to use the TL and therefore, no chance to interact with members of the target group (Norris Motivation, 2001: Int.).

Brown (2000) cited in (Norris – Holt, 2001: 8), makes the point that both integrative and instrumental motivation are not necessarily mutually exclusive. Learners rarely select one form of motivation when learning an SL, but rather a combination of both orientations. He cites the example of international students residing in the United States, learning English for academic purposes, while at the same time wishing to become integrated with the people and culture of that country.

Motivation is an important factor in L₂ achievement. For this reason it is important to identify both the type and combination of motivation that assists in the successful acquisition of an SL.

At the same time, it is necessary to view motivation as one of a number of variables in an intricate model of inter-related individual and situational factors, which are unique to each language learner.

Students' motivation is of primary importance in acquisition of knowledge and skills. Motivation – to use the terms of Gardner and Lambert (1977) and their research colleagues – may be “integrative” or “instrumental”.

By “integrative” is meant the desire on the part of the learner to be accepted by and to enter the community of the target culture. By “instrumental” is meant the desire to learn an SL or culture in order to obtain a better education, a better-job, or better grades.

In our view “instrumental” and “integrative” should not be considered as standing at different ends of the learning process. Both types of motivation should be fostered in the language classroom. Success, as demonstrated by good grades in language study, may lead to “integrative” motivation.

Moreover, it is extremely difficult in many schools in communities where there are no TL speakers in the community,

no films, and no other resources to achieve “integrative” motivation (Finocchiaro & Brumfit, 1983: 33-34).

2.11 Grammar and the Communicative Approach

Communicatively – taught grammar is a modern linguistic approach that emerged in the late 1970s as a reaction against prevalent structural grammar. It was established by British Linguists namely Wilkins, Hymes, Candline, Widdowson and others. This approach tries to reconcile language usage with use. That is, to acquire grammar not simply as linguistic forms (e.g. present perfect, present progressive, past tense, phrasal verbs, relatives, etc.), but also as a communicative resource. While the structural technique concentrates largely on the form of the items. Communicatively – taught grammar gives prominence to the meaning of the grammatical forms as specified by the functional tags.

The main characteristics of this treatment of grammar can be summed up as follows:

- 1** - It involves the use of form and meaning of language items simultaneously. It takes into consideration knowledge of linguistic rules that is rules, of the construction of the language, and the ability to manipulate this knowledge for communicative purposes. Grammatical forms, therefore, are taught not for their own sake as in

structural or traditional grammar, but as a means of carrying out communicative acts. However, this approach does not focus on the grammatical form of items, nor does it give abstract descriptions or definitions. Instead, it concentrates on the meanings or the notions underlying these forms. This is followed lest the communicative aspect of the language be lost in the effort of mastering the grammatical form through conventional practice or manipulation of sentences. The main purpose is to help the learners build up language competence through use, and not through knowledge of linguistic rules.

1-1 Through its emphasis on meaning, this approach assumes that incorrect grammatical forms (e.g. I have speak, she go everyday to school, etc.) can be eradicated gradually as the learner advances in learning and in using the language. Confusion in the conceptual meaning (i.e. of grammatical notions) is more difficult to overcome in later stages. Hence, notions and functions should coexist with structures. The learner should know first which notions or ideas he wants to communicate. Subsequently he expresses these notions or concepts through communicative functions, i.e. speech acts encoded into grammatical forms.

1-2 It tries to express the various notions or meaning that may belong to a single grammatical form as it introduces them separately and in different situations or stage in order to highlight their meaning and use. The meanings of verbs tenses and modals are good examples of this grammar. For example, the different grammatical notions of the modal “will”, namely: willingness, polite requests, intention, insistence and prediction can best be taught at different stages since the situations in which these notions are used differ greatly. This strategy of presenting one notions at a time ensures that all possible notions are introduced as separate teaching objectives.

2- Another feature of this approach is connected with the process of learning. It is fewer teachers centered. The communicative activities associated with it make pupils less dependent on the teacher as the giver of knowledge pupils are encouraged to recognize for themselves grammatical forms as they are working out activities in groups, pairs or individually. Despite all merits, the communicative teaching of grammar suffers from the following shortcomings:

2-1 To teach linguistic forms and language functions to gather as linked pairs might confuse pupils and might lead them to over-generalize or draw wrong conclusions. Thus they

may believe that each linguistic form can only express one particular function.

2-2 Too much emphasis on functional meaning would not give pupils sufficient knowledge of the linguistic rules (i.e., system of the language) to carry out or extend a communicative task efficiently. A structural / notional grammar would be more appropriate to avoid the danger of focusing on form or meaning.

2-3 To many teachers, communicatively taught grammar does not seem systematic or coherent, as it is restricted to the notions and functions of the language. This usually occurs randomly rather than logically. Consequently this grammar is not clearly defined or expressed through a convenient system because grammatical forms are encoded into communicative functions.

2-4 Grammar taught in this way requires a competent teacher, so that he can create appropriate communicative situations to provide the pupils with the opportunity to practice the grammar points in a natural interesting way, and not through the manipulation of linguistic exercises or sentences.

Such an EFL teacher is difficult to find in a foreign context where all FL teachers are non-native speakers of the target language (Al-Mutawa and Kailani, 1989: 74-75; Trim, 1985: 145; Candlin, 1984 : 110).

2.12 Notion/ Function Vs. Pattern/ Sentence

Foreign language learners sometimes misunderstand these four concepts. Notions and functions, in the first place, are both a way of describing language from a semantic point of view. Notional meaning is, however, conceptual such as notions of time, space, location, quantity, and case. On the other hand, functional meaning is social such as functions of agreement, approving, forgiving, inferring, greeting, etc. Notions are concepts (i.e. ideas) underlying functions (i.e. speech acts). In other words, notions are expressed through communicative functions, which are in turn, encoded through several language forms and exponents. This process may be represented diagrammatically as follows:

Situation → Notion → Function → Form

This is the main concern of the communicative syllabus where the grammatical forms are approached through meaning (i.e., through notions and functions) (Al-Mutawa and Kailani, 1989: 79-80).

Patterns and sentences however, are a way of describing language from a formal point of view. Nevertheless, the pattern is the underlying design or formula of a sentence which functions as an actual utterance like a communicative function. Patterns, in this respect, may be equated with notions, sentences can also be equated to functions since both are encoded through

grammatical forms. However, the approach with structural grammar is different as known below:

Situation → Form / Pattern → Sentence → Meaning

This way of approaching meaning through form is the cornerstone of structural grammar, which is still followed in our schools.

Patterns in English are limited in number. There are only eight basic patterns in the language and for each one there may be an infinite number of utterances based on it. These major patterns are as follows':

1- S + V adv

E.g., Merriam is in the house.

2- S + V

E.g., The child laughed .

3- S + V +O

E.g., Somebody caught the ball.

4- S + V + Cs

E.g., Fatima is kind.

5- S + V + O + Co

E.g., We have proved him wrong.

6- S + V + O₁ + O₂

E.g., She sent him a letter.

7- S + V + O + adv

E.g., He put the plate on the table.

8- There + be + noun + adverb.

E.g., There is a dog in the garden

(Quark and Greenbaum, 1973: p.191)

The above sentences are condensed examples of the basic patterns. They can be expanded by adding new elements or forms to each of them.

Thus, the sentence of the second pattern (S+V) can be extended into a sentence like “the young child laughed merrily”, and similarly with the other sentences (Al-Mutawa and Kailani, 1989: 80).

2.13 Focus on Form in Communicative Context

It is this idea of focus on form in communicative contexts that is currently supported by both theory and research. However, many educators believe in a separation of form-focused activities from communicative activities in classroom settings (Lightbown, 1998: pp.177-196).

These peoples, as Lightbown (Ibid) observes, are concerned with attempts to emphasize form may cause negative reactions on the part of the learners who are engaged in expressing their meaning. Therefore, to encourage meaningful interaction, they believe that focus on form and communication should be treated as separate learning activities.

However, one way-and the most effective way-of addressing this problem are to consider activities that result in attention to form while maintaining meaningful communication and using form for communication. If the goal of second language learning is to develop fluency, as well as accuracy and complexity (Skehan, 1996: 17-38-62) and if accuracy is not achieved unless learners pay attention to form, learning may be more effective if learners focus on form while using language for communication. “Psychologists have long shown that learners remember things with reference to the context in text in which they learn them therefore, focus on language forms in the context of communication may encourage learning, and the forms may be easier to remember when students need them in future similar contexts” (Lightbown, 1998).

2.14 Pedagogical Possibilities and strategies

From a communicative perspective, the most effective way to assist language learning in the classroom is through communicative tasks: that is, activities, which encourage talk, in order not to produce language as an end, but “as a means of sharing ideas and opinions, collaborating toward a single goal, or competing to achieve individual goals” (Pica et al., 1993:10).

It is argued that such activities provide a vehicle for the presentation of appropriate input to SL learners through negotiation of meaning (Long & Crookes, 1992: 26-27-56),

thereby developing both communicative and linguistic competence (Nobuyoshi & Ellis, 1993: 47, 203-210).

However, the problem is that communicative tasks are generally interpreted as being principally meaning-based classroom activities. Ellis (1982: p.75), for example, describing the features of a communicative task, states that “the focus of the enterprise must be on the message throughout, rather than on the channel, i.e., the speakers must be concerned with what they have to say rather than how they are going to say” Similarly, Nunan, (1989: 10) considers communicative tasks “as a piece of classroom work which involves learners on comprehending, manipulating, producing or interacting in the TL while their attention is principally focused on meaning rather than form”. Although both Ellis and Nunan support form – focused activities in their recent writings, they define communicative tasks as activities which focus mainly on meaning. In terms of grammatical development, in particular, the contribution of communicative tasks has been shown to be limited. What may be needed, then are integrative activities that can integrate a focus on form into existing L₂ communicative activities.

There are varieties of ways to incorporate a focus on form into communicative activities in classroom contexts. One way is “by design”: that is, communicative activities can be designed with an advanced, deliberate focus on form. Another methods of integrating forms and communication is “by process”: that is, by

incorporating focus on form in the process of, and as it occurs naturally in, classroom communication (Nassaji, 1999: 4 - 5).

2.15 Previous Studies

The following studies are found to be of relation to the present study in one aspect or another:-

2.15.1 Praphu (Cited by Beretta & Davies, 1985)

The researcher conducted an experiment in communicative language teaching. The sample consisted of 50 students and there were two groups, the experimental group and the control one. Then he found that the experimental group which was received meaning – based instructions and did well on the meaning – based test, but showed low results on the discrete – point test. The control group, on the other hand, having received structural instruction, performed better on the grammar structure tasks rather than on the global and integrative tests. The outcome of the experiment is quite logical and obvious and can be explained by the wash back effect student performance which was better on the tasks they were trained for .

2.15.2 Sysoyev (1999)

Sysoyev (1999) states the issue of L₂ grammar to ESL students with the focus on form and meaning, a method of integrative grammar teaching, consisting of three major stages they are: a) exploration, b) explanation and c) expression (i.e. The proposed EEE approach).

To show how the proposed method of integrative grammar teaching can function and what students' attitude towards it will be, several lessons were conducted to see how the method really works and what its potentials. The students were 10 undergraduate international students.

All students were enrolled into the ESL programme and had previously experienced grammar teaching. That explains the use of more complex grammatical constructions, compared to the rules used in this study. However, their mistakes in the first and third stages show that students have some knowledge but it is not systematized.

The method worked fairly successfully with the students. They were willing to respond and participate in classroom communication. To find their attitudes towards learning grammar using the EEE approach, an anonymous evaluative questionnaire was administered to the group after several lessons of integrative grammar learning.

The questions were formulated in such a way that the students would be able to express their attitudes towards each task of the new method, as well as towards form focused instruction only. So, his study described a way of combining form and meaning in teaching L₂ grammar to ESL students.

Results show that the group that received the proposed EEE approach in teaching L₂ grammar was better in their

achievement in grammar than the one that was not exposed to the proposed EEE approach.

2.15.3 Al-Samarrai (2002)

The aims of this study are preparing a teaching programme based on the principles of the integrative approach to language teaching, and finding out the effect of using this approach in TEFL on the Iraqi intermediate school learners in their linguistic achievement.

Second stage classes in Okadh intermediate school for boys, are selected as the population of this study.

The sample consisted of 52 students and the teaching material that the researcher has chosen was 9 units, from book 4 of the series of NECI . Then he adopted the IA in teaching them. The students of the experimental group who are taught by using the IA innovated in this study were not better at their linguistic achievement as measured by both the written and oral post – test than those of the control group who were taught by using the AL. The researcher hypothesized that integration in language teaching will yield better results in the learners' linguistic achievement than the prevailing situation as appears in the textbook. Thus, it is concluded that integration in English teaching within the limits of this study does not yield better results in linguistic achievement than the prevailing approach in the textbook. Consequently, the hypothesis of this study is rejected.

The students of the control group got better results in the oral post – test than those of the experimental group. This confirms the problem that the AL does not develop the learner's overall command of language.

2.16 Discussion of Previous Studies

The previous studies have been discussed thoroughly and they are found to be in corresponded with the present study in some points and are not with others, and as follows:

- 1- The present study corresponds with Al – Samarrai's (2002) and Prabhu's (1985) in teaching integrative SL Language instructions to the experimental group, and aiming to find out the effect of these instructions on the sample's achievement. While Sysoyev (1999) taught integrative grammar to one group only which is the experimental group, and no reference for the existence of a control group in his study.
- 2- The sample of Sysoyev (1999) included one group, which does not correspond with the present study; while in Al Samarrai's (2002) and Praphu's (1985) study the sample included two groups, an experimental group and a control one, just like the present study.
- 3- Al – Samarrai's (2002), Sysoyev (1999) and Praphu's (1985) studies were interested in English as an L₂, which also make them correspond with the present study.

- 4- Al – Samarrai's (2002), Sysoyev's (1999) and Parphu's (1985) studies are in correspondence with the present one in that the researcher himself/ herself has carried out the experiment.

From all the above, it is found out that Sysoyev's (1999) study is the nearest study to the present one in the following aspects:

- 1- Both studies aim to find out the effect of teaching integrative L₂ Grammar by using the EEE method on the samples' achievement in grammar.
- 2- Both studies carried out almost the same procedures except in the experimental design where Sysoyev (1999) used an experimental group only, but in the present investigation two groups are designed, a control group and an experimental one. In addition, Sysoyev used a questionnaire along with a post – test while in the present study a pre and post test are used.

Chapter Three

“Procedures of the Study”

3.1 An Introductory Note

The following pages present a detailed description of the steps and procedure that are followed in order to achieve the aim of this study. The description of the procedural measures is going to include: (1) experimental design; (2) population and sample selection procedure; (3) equivalence of the experiment subjects and (4) a pilot study; (5) instruments and statistical methods of the research including: T-test, chi-square and percentage grade and using alpha-Cronbach Formula for computing reliability.

3.1.1 The Experimental Design

The type of the experimental design adopted in the present study is called the Partial Control Design, and it is also called Non – Randomized Control – Group pre – test and post – test Design. (Al – Zubai and Al – Ghannam, 1981: 128 – 129)

This design follows the form shown in table (1).

Table 1
The Experimental Design Map

| The Group | The test | Independent Variable | The test |
|------------------------|------------|--|-------------|
| The experimental group | Pre – test | The EEE approach (integrative grammar) | Post – test |
| The Control group | Pre – test | — | Post – test |

In this design, only the experimental group receives the independent variable, and thus is taught by the EEE suggested approach adopted in this study, whereas the control group is taught by using the conventional AL approach stated in the teacher's guide.

Then both groups will be subjected to a post- test in order to measure their linguistic achievement in grammar, i.e., the dependent variable.

3.2 Population and Sample Selection

3.2.1 Population

The population of the present study is the 5th year femal secondary schools students in day time in Baghdad.

These are distributed into Al – Risafa and Al – Karkh Districts. The researcher has randomly chosen Al – Karkh District. Since the beginning of the academic year 1997, 1998,

the general Directorate of Education in Al – Karkh has been divided into two directorates:

They are:

- 1- The General Directorate of Education in Al – Karkh the first.
- 2- The General Directorate of Education in Al – Karkh, the second.

The researcher has randomly chosen the General Directorate of education in Al – Karkh, the second. Al – Dorah City Sector has randomly been chosen. After dropping the secondary schools for boys and evening secondary schools for boys and girls, Al – Nahdha Secondary school for girls has randomly been chosen.

3.2.2 The Sample

Among the other schools in Baghdad, the researcher has randomly chosen AL- Nahdha Secondary School for Girls to represent the sample, and which includes five sections of fifth scientific branch class students in this school. Sections C and D were randomly chosen as intact classes to represent the experimental and the control groups respectively.

There are thirty-four students in section C and thirty-two in section D. The students who are repeating the year in the same class are excluded from their previous knowledge of the material affect the results of the study, therefore, four in section C and two in section D are excluded from the sample.

Consequently, the total number of the study sample becomes sixty students: thirty in each group in order to increase the sensitivity of the experiment and thereby increase the probability of detecting the effect that actually occurs, the students equalized in the following variables:

- 1- The level of mothers' education.
- 2- The level of fathers' education.
- 3- The subjects' level of achievement in English in the fourth secondary stage.
- 4- The subjects' level of achievement in the pre - test.

The level of parents' education experimented with the other alternatives see table (2):

Table 2

The Level of Parents' Education

| | | |
|--------|---|---------------------------------|
| Number | 1 | Primary school certificate |
| Number | 2 | Intermediate school certificate |
| Number | 3 | Secondary school certificate |
| Number | 4 | (B.A), (M.A) or (ph. D.) grades |

3.2.2.1 The Level of Mothers' Education

After calculating the level of mothers' education (Appendix 4) and by applying the χ^2 – formula, it is found out that the calculated χ^2 -value is 1.256. By computed this value to the

tabulated χ^2 - value which is 9.49, no difference of statistical significance is, thus found, see table (3).

Table 3
Chi – Square Value for the Difference in Mothers' Education Level

| Variable | Group | No. | Primary | intermediate | Secondary | B.A M.A& BH.D | df | Computed χ^2 value | Table χ^2 Value |
|--------------------|--------|-----|---------|--------------|-----------|---------------|----|-------------------------|----------------------|
| Mothers' education | Exper. | 30 | 6 | 8 | 10 | 6 | 3 | 1.256 | 7.82 |
| | Cont | 30 | 8 | 10 | 6 | 6 | | | |

3.2.2.2 The Level of Fathers' Education

The level of The Fathers' education (Appendix 3) is calculated by applying the χ^2 - formula. Therefore, it is found out that the calculated χ^2 -value is 0.38. By comparing this value to the tabulated χ^2 -value 9.49, no difference of statistical significance is found out, see table (4)

Table 4
Chi – Square Value for the Difference in Fathers' Education Level

| Variable | Group | No. | primary | intermediate | Secondary | B.A M.A& BH.D | df | Computed χ^2 value | Table χ^2 Value |
|--------------------|--------|-----|---------|--------------|-----------|---------------|----|-------------------------|----------------------|
| Father's education | Exper. | 30 | 5 | 5 | 11 | 9 | 3 | 0.38 | 7.82 |
| | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|--|------|----|---|---|---|---|--|--|--|
| | Cont | 30 | 6 | 6 | 9 | 9 | | | |
|--|------|----|---|---|---|---|--|--|--|

3.2.2.3 The Subjects' Level of Achievement in English In The Fourth Secondary Year (2002-2003)

As shown in table 5, there is no difference of statistical significance between the experimental group and the control one in their achievement scores in English in the academic year (2002-2003) since the calculated t-value is 0.270 and which is found out to be lower than the table t – value which is 2.00 on the level of 0.05 of significance and 58 degree of freedom see table (5) and Appendix (2).

Table 5

The t – Value of the Subjects' Level of Achievement in the Fourth Secondary School

| Group | N | \bar{X} | S ² | t-value | | df | Level of Significance |
|--------------|----|-----------|----------------|------------|-------|----|-----------------------|
| | | | | Calculated | Table | | |
| Experimental | 30 | 69 | 251.034 | 0.270 | 2.000 | 58 | 0.05 |
| Control | 30 | 67.9 | 204.989 | | | | |

3.2.2.4 The Subjects' Previous Knowledge in English in the Pre – test.

In order to equalize both groups in their previous knowledge of the experimental teaching material a pre – test is

constructed. This test consists of twenty multiple-choice items and its total mark is one hundred see Appendix (5).

After applying the test on the 2nd of November; two days before starting the experiment, it is found out that the calculated t-value is 0.406 by using the t-test formula, so it is found non - significant at 0.05 level since the tabulated t-value is 2.00, see Appendix (6). As a result, both the experimental and control groups are equal in this variable, see table (6).

Table 6

**The t-Value of the Subjects' Previous Knowledge in the Pre
– test Level of Significance 0.05**

| Group | N | \bar{X} | S ² | t-value | | df | Level of Significance |
|--------------|----|-----------|----------------|------------|-------|----|-----------------------|
| | | | | Calculated | Table | | |
| Experimental | 30 | 59 | 214.482 | 0.406 | 2.000 | 58 | 0.05 |
| Control | 30 | 54.83 | 274.971 | | | | |

3.3 Factors Jeopardizing Internal and External Validity

Before claiming that the independent variable (the EEE suggested approach) really produces a change in the dependent variable (the students' linguistic achievement in grammar), the researcher has made sure that the following extraneous variables

did not have effects that could be mistaken for the effect of the independent variable. All possible precautions are taken into account to minimize the effect of these variables throughout the execution of the experiment.

3.3.1 Contemporary History

Contemporary history refers to the specific events, other than the independent variable, that occur during the period of the experiment and might cause the result (Lewin, 1979: 388; Christensen, 1980: 94).

No important or unusual events has happened during the period of the experiment.

3.3.2 Selection Bias

Selection bias exists when a differential selection procedure is used for placing in the various comparison groups (Christensen, 1980: 98). The sample is randomly selected from the population, and then students are randomly assigned to the various treatment groups. The two groups are statistically equated to the level of parents education and on the students achievement in English in the fourth secondary school and in the pre -test grade.

3.3.3 Experimental Morality

This means the attendance of students, the interference of the teacher to his class, etc. The experiment did not face the effect of such a factor during the period of the experimental time except for non-attendance of some of the sample students which

is considered a natural state, although it rarely occurred in both groups.

3.3.4 Maturation

“Biological and psychological processes within the subjects may change during the progress of the experiment which will affect their responses” (Dalen, 1962: 267). “Subjects may become tired, bored, wiser, or influenced by the incidental learning or experiences that they encounter through normal maturation” (Best, 1981: 64; Robinson, 1981: 10). The current experiment lasted for two months. It started on 4/11/2003 and ended on 30/12/2003. This period is not so long that the pupils' responses might be attributed to the change, that occurred with the passage of time.

3.3.5 The Classroom Environment

This experiment is carried out in one secondary school for girls, choosing the two groups, the experimental group and the control one, from the same secondary school for girls of the same capabilities and classroom environment, such as heating, lightning, size, noise, effect and number of desks. Accordingly, this variable be also controlled.

3.3.6 The Teacher

The researcher, herself, has taught the two groups, the experimental group and the control one, so that she can control

the variable of teacher's bias to the traditional method of teaching, as the researcher has felt of that before carrying out the experiment and during a talk with the actual teacher of the classes.

3.4 The Instrument of the Study

3.4.1 The Instructional Material

Book 7 of the series of the NECI is the prescribed textbook of the fifth secondary class students. It consists of fourteen units having activities of dialogue, oral practice, pronunciation, reading and written homework in each unit. The researcher has chosen units 3, 4, 5 and 6 (with the agreement of the class teacher) as a teaching material for both groups. The content of the oral practice exercises is limited to:

- 1- The present continuous tense and the simple present in chapter 3. Certain verbs are used mostly in the present simple instead of the present continuous – like
 - Verbs of sensation: see, hear, smell, etc.
 - Verbs that indicate mental states like know, believe, think, intend, etc.
 - Verbs that indicate states or qualities such as size, and ownership which consists of, include, own, and have.
- 2- Determiners in chapter 4: which include some, any, many few, a lot of, how many and how much. Determiners can be identifiers or quantifiers.

- 3- Future tense in chapter 5: which includes will, shall + base, will +infinitive, going to, and be+ing form.
- 4- Mass nouns in chapter 6: which include countable and uncountable nouns.

3.4.2 Lesson PLanning

“For students, evidence of a plan shows them that the teacher has devoted time to thinking about the class. It strongly suggests a level of professionalism and a commitment to the kind of preparation they might reasonably expect. Lack of a plan may suggest the opposite of these teacher attributes...

For the teacher, a plan – however informal- gives the lesson a framework, an overall shape. It is true that he or she may end up departing from it at stages of the lesson, but at the very least it will be something to fall back on. Of course, good teachers are flexible and respond creatively to what happens in the classroom, but they also need to have thought ahead, have a destination they want their students to reach and know how they are going to get their ” (Harmer, 2000: 121).

“Teaching is best when the teacher is able to draw his lesson plans according to the objectives needs, interests and capacities of the pupils involved. Lesson planning varies according to the subject the teacher intends to teach. Some subjects may necessitate detailed plans while others require a brief outline” (Al – Mutawa and Kailani, 1989: 140).

Taking all the points above in consideration, the researcher has previously prepared the necessary lesson plan see Appendix (7). As for the control group the lesson plan was worked out according to the instructions of the teachers' guide of book VII on pages (37 – 73). The experimental group's lesson plan was worked out for Book VII as in the instructions of the teacher's guide except for the “Grammar” activities in the OP, the lesson plan was worked out according to the independent variable, which is teaching Integrative L₂ Grammar by using the EEE method.

3.4.3 The Post - test

In order to select the test items wisely, Baron and Bernard (1958:28) say: "It is necessary to define the purpose of the testing programme select the areas to be tested in the light of the purpose, apply the criteria of good tests and evaluate the test in the light of experience".

Beginning with the purpose of the achievement post - test in this study, firstly the students' linguistic achievement will determine the effect of using the EEE approach in order to accept or reject the hypothesis stated in (1.4). Secondly the researcher has drawn the following table of specifications describing the nature of the test items.

Table 7
Table of Specifications

| No. of question | Question type | No. of Item | Knowledge tested | Marks plotted |
|-----------------|---------------|-------------|------------------|---------------|
|-----------------|---------------|-------------|------------------|---------------|

| | | | | |
|---|-----------------------------------|----|---------------------------------------|----|
| 1 | Correct the verb between brackets | 20 | Syntactic structures (production) | 60 |
| 2 | Multiple choice | 20 | Syntactic structures & function words | 40 |

Since the ultimate goal of this test is to measure the learners' achievement where questions of recognition and production are integrated, the test, however consists of forty items Appendix (8).

For applying the criteria of good tests and the evaluation of the test in the light of experience, two criteria were taken into consideration: validity and reliability. Item Analysis is also assured.

3.4.3.1 The Validity of the Post - test

"Validity refers to the truthfulness of the test and is, therefore, an important characteristic" (Ross and Stanley, 1954: 107). It is, in other words, "the extent to which a test measures what is suppose to measure and nothing else." (Heaton, 1975: 153).

Following Dalen's opinion (1962: 337) who says: "An investigator may check one or more of the following types of validity: face validity, content validity, predictive validity, concurrent validity and construct validity".

Two types of validity are evaluated in this study: face validity and content validity.

3.4.3.2 Face Validity

On the one hand, it refers to the way the test looks right to test administrators, educators, and testees (Smith and Adams, 1966: 38, Heaton, 1975:153). Accordingly, the first version of the post test was exposed to a jury⁽¹⁾ of experts who approved its face validity after proposing some modifications.

It is necessary to note that the post - test is judged valid by all the members of the jury with 100% agreement.

3.4.3.3 Rational (or Content) Validation

On the other hand, it depends on a logical analysis of the test content to see whether the test contains a representative sample of the relevant language skills.

It involves comparing the test with:

1. a statement of what the content ought to be, i.e., the test table of specification, and
2. gathering the judgment of experts, see (Alderson et al., 1995:171 ff).

(1) The jury members are:

- 1- Professor Al-Rawi, Sabah S., PH.D./College of Languages.
- 2- Professor Al-Ani, Ayef Habeeb/College of Education /Ibn Rushd.
- 3- Assistant Professor Al-Dulaimi, Munthir M., ph.D./College of Languages.
- 4- Assistant Professor AL-Said Muayyad M., ph.D./College of Education /Ibn Rushd.
- 5- Assistant Professor Al-Jumaily, Abdl-Kareem,ph.D./College of Education /Ibn Rushd.
- 6- Instructor Al Qaraghollu Dhuha Atallah, ph.D./College of Basic Education.
- 7- Al- Jubori Radhiah Kadhim /Al-Nahda Secondary School for girls/ the actual teacher of English for the fifth year scientific branch.

Content validity is established by specifying the domain to be sampled for testing and then selecting test items to represent that domain. (Davies, et al, 1999: 222)

Having analyzed the content of the units under study (see 3.5.1...) and since only a certain linguistic element is studied, the content validity of the test is restricted to the table of specification drawn, see table (8) and then the test is exposed to the same jury members (P.64) who verified, its content validity⁽¹⁾.

3.4.3.4 The Pilot Administration of the Post - test

The Pilot administration of the post – test was carried out on the 26th of December/2003. The test was given to a sample of one hundred students of the fifth secondary class in Damascus Secondary School for Girls in order to:

1. ensure the clarity of the test instructions,
2. estimate the time required by the testees to work out the test items and
3. determine the effectiveness of the test items in terms of their difficulty level and discrimination power in the light of the testees responses.

It was found out that the instructions were clear and familiar to the testees and that the average time required for working out

(1) After asking Dr.Safaa' Tariq Habeeb & Dr.Kammel AL-Kubaissy, they decided that there is no need for a testing map. So it is not taken into account with the agreement of the supervisor.

all the items was 50 minutes. Then, the test items are analyzed after scoring the testees papers in order to determine their difficulty level and discrimination power.

3.4.3.5 Item Analysis:

The researcher has ranked the test papers from the highest to the lowest scores, then separated two subgroups of these test papers, an upper group representing the top 50% count of the total group, and a lower group representing the bottom 50%. This method is justified by (Remmers et al., 1965:269) as the best proportion for use in item analysis. Then, the researcher has tabulated the number of testees in the upper and the lower groups who answered the item correctly. After that, the difficulty level of each item which means the proportion of testees who answered the item correctly has been calculated. After the application of the item difficulty formula⁽¹⁾, it was

(1) Item difficulty formula $\text{difficulty} = R/T \times 100$ where:

R: the number of testes who got the item right.

T: the total number of testes included in the item analysis.

This means: $H_C + L_C/T$. (Gronlund, 1965: 267)

(2) Discrimination power $= \frac{R_U - R_L}{\frac{1}{2}T}$

R_U = the number of testees in the upper group who got the items right.

R_L = the number of testees in the lower group who got the items right.

This means: $\frac{H_C - L_C}{\frac{1}{2}T}$ (Gronlund, 1965: 268)

found out that items difficulty level ranged between 0.27 and 0.67 percent, see table (9). Remmers et al. (1965:266) state that the test items should vary in their difficulty level between 10 to 90. So, the items' level of difficulty are considered acceptable. Reading the discrimination power of the test items, it was found out, that it ranged between 0.20 and 0.68. According to Ebell's index of discrimination, good classroom test items have indices of discrimination of 0.33 or more. (Ebell, 1972: 399).

These items which are found to be less than 0.33 are 7,9,10 in question 1, and items 3,7,9,11,12,14,17,19,20 in question 2, are modified later and then exposed to the same jury members who verified their suitability and validity for the level of the sample of the study.

3.4.3.6 Reliability of the Post - test

In order to compute the reliability coefficient of the two post - tests, Alpha – Cronbach formula is used. It is a measure of internal consistency and reliability. It indicates how well a group of items together measure the trait of interest by estimating the proportion of test variance due to common factors among the items. If all items on a test measure the same underlying dimension, then the items will be highly correlated with all other items.

Alpha is an extension of Kuder – Richardson formula, but differs in this, it can describe the variance whether or not items

are dichotomously scored. Values for Alpha range from 0 to 1.0. (Davies et al., 1997: 39).

Therefore, the reliability coefficient is found out to be 0.81 which is also considered acceptable (Harris, 1969: 16).

3.4.3.7 Scoring Scheme of the Test

The test involves 2 sets: multiple choice and verb tense correction. Each set consists of 20 items. The distribution of scores on the items is as follows:

- 1- Correction consists of 20 items, 3 marks for each items, so the total marks of this question would be 60.
- 2- Multiple choice consists of 20 items, 2 marks for each item, so the total marks of this question would be 40.

The total mark of the test is 100.

3.5 Experiment Application

The instruction of both groups started on 1 November 2003 and ended on 30/12/2003. It lasted for two months. The researcher herself taught the two groups to control the teacher variable in the experiment. The lessons were arranged for the two groups on Saturday, Sunday, Monday, Tuesday and Wednesday every week (five lessons perweek). The researcher taught the control group all the material by using the Audio-

lingual Approach, while she taught the experimental groups the tenses by using the EEE approach. As indicated in the teachers guide, oral practice should take the greater part of the class period, because oral practice includes all the grammar points, which usually take the form of pattern exercises.

Therefore, the researcher distributed the class time as shown in table (8).

Table 8

Teaching Activities and the Time Allotted for Teaching Them

| Activity | Number of Minutes Per Lesson |
|---------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 1. Dialogue | 5 |
| 2. Oral practice | |
| a. Structure note | 15 |
| b. Situation | 5 |
| c. Drills | 10 |
| 3. Pronunciation | 3 |
| 4. Reading | 4 |
| 5. Written homework | 3 |
| Total | 45 |

3.5.1 The Control Group

For teaching the control group, the researcher has followed the instructions given in the teacher's guide, (Teachers' guide, 1994) which recommends that each activity mentioned in 3.4 should be taught within a specific time as shown in table 5.

3.5.2 The Experimental Group

The researcher taught the experimental group by using the audio-lingual method, which was recommended in the teacher's Guide, except for teaching grammar or structure notes which are found in chapters 3 and 6, where the EEE approach is used. The EEE approach consists of three equally important stages:

Exploration, Explanation, and Expression. Each stage or step is explained in details as follows:

Exploration: It is the first stage of integrative grammar teaching. This stage is characterized by “inductive learning”. Students are given sentences illustrating a certain grammar rule and are asked as a group to find the pattern, and with the help of the teacher, to formulate the rule. Many scholars have argued against passive or inactive learning, in which teachers refer to the textbook for the explanations of rules. Students should be given opportunities to figure out everything by themselves, receiving help only when necessary. To make the task easier at the beginning, some grammatical forms or endings can be highlighted. Students tend to prefer assignments that allow them to explore the language. The knowledge they obtain becomes theirs and it is often much easier to remember. Exploration, then, works as an excellent tool for motivation.

Explanation: It is the second stage of learning. As students find sequences or patterns in the examples they used during the exploration stage, the teacher or the students can summarize what was previously discovered, now focusing on the form. In

same situations it may be essential to go to the textbook and together with students relate “textbook rules” with the examples and findings of the exploration stage. The explanation stage is quite important because students feel safer when they know the rules and have some source to go back to in case of confusion or for future reference. Depending on students' proficiency, confidence, and actual performance, this stage can sometimes be omitted however, students should be aware of and experience the strategies they may use to refer to the explicit rules, if needed.

Expression: It is the third and last stage of the process. After discovering certain grammatical patterns in the exploration stage and getting to know the rules in the explanation stage, students start practicing the production of meaningful utterances with each other in communication and interactive tasks. The rationale of this stage is to provide students experience in applying their acquired knowledge in practice by making meaningful utterances. On the one hand, this may also serve as a motivation technique, since learners can actually see what they can do with what they have learned. On the other hand, the expression stage gives them the opportunity to practice communicating under the teacher's supervision, which usually assures the students that they can produce a correct utterance. Communicative interaction will be better if it is content –based, which allows students to

relate it to something they care or know about, thus making it authentic (Sysoyev, 1999: 4 – 5) .

To show how the proposed method of integrative grammar teaching can function and what students' attitude towards it will be, several lessons were conducted to see how the method really works and what its potential is. When the researcher started teaching the experimental material, she begins by introducing the topic (tenses only) for group exploration and then elicits students' responses.

The way the teacher gives the task as in the teaching plan is actually amazing and potentially very powerful to find the patterns or making a new rule. This invitation to participate had a tremendous effect on the students. It contained several implicit messages. One was that because “making new rules” is a discovery, it is acceptable to make mistakes; students need not to be afraid of talking and expressing the thoughts. Another was encouraging confidence and students' potential, who were responsible for investigation and participation in the learning process. The flow of teacher –student interaction, depends primarily on the students' reactions, responses, and their understanding of what is to be learned. If students do not understand something, or misinterpret the rule, the teacher tries to control it and puts them on the right track by paraphrasing their statements or with leading questions.

In the explanation stage it is important to make a connection between the examples and the explicit rules. This connection will help learners build on what they already have discovered. After the explanation of the explicit rules, the teacher again gives students meaningful examples of how and in what situations the tense can be used. After discovering the rules and providing students with models of their usage, it will be interesting to see how learners are going to use their knowledge in the actual interaction.

Certainly, the third stage represents a meaning based task, which reflects the nature of social interaction. It enables students to simulate a real-life situation, asking follow-up questions and reacting consequently.

Thus, the major advantage of combining form and meaning is that in practicing the form in meaning-based tasks, students negotiate the meaning in their L₂. That results in spontaneous use of the TL (Sysoyev, 1999: 20).

Although groups can be very effective, teachers should not be naïve about group interaction. Even though it looks like students who creating meaningful utterances by themselves, the teachers holds the responsibility for making sure that there is no misuse, that “leaders” don not impose wrong forms and rules, and the students have equal opportunities to participate and express their thoughts.

3.6 The Statistical Tools

The following statistical tools are used in this study:

1. **Percentages:** It is used to estimate the proportions of the jury members' responses to the pre and post – tests.
2. **t – test for two independent samples:** It is used to find out the significance of differences between the experimental and control groups in the recall test and several non – experimental variables to ensure their equivalence. The following formula is used:-

$$t = \frac{\bar{X}_1 - \bar{X}_2}{\sqrt{\frac{(n_1 - 1)S_1^2 + (n_2 - 1)S_2^2}{n_1 + n_2 - 2} \left(\frac{1}{n_1} + \frac{1}{n_2} \right)}}$$

Where:

\bar{X}_1 = the mean of the experimental group.

\bar{X}_2 = the mean of the control group.

n_1 = the number of subjects in the experimental group.

n_2 = the number of subjects in the control group.

S_1^2 = the variance of the experimental group.

S_2^2 = the variance of the control group.

(Class and Stanley, 1970: 295)

3. **Chi – square:** It is used to find out the significance of differences in the variables of parents' education. The following formula is used:-

$$\chi^2 = \sum \left[\frac{(f_o - f_e)^2}{f_e} \right]$$

(Minium et al., 1999: 385)

Where:

f_o = the observed frequencies.

f_e = the expected or theoretical frequencies.

4. **Alpha – Cronbach Formula:** It is used to calculate the reliability coefficient of the achievement test. The following formula is used:-

$$\alpha = \frac{n}{n-1} \left(1 - \frac{\sum S_1^2}{S_\chi^2} \right)$$

Where:

S_1^2 = the variance of a single item.

N = number of items in a test.

\sum = Summation sign indicating that variance is summed over all items.

(Mehrens and Lehmann, 1999: 256)

Chapter Four

"Analysis and Discussion of the Results"

4.1 An Introductory Note

At the end of the experiment and in order to achieve the aims of the study and test its null hypothesis, the researcher has statistically analyzed the data obtained through administering the post test to the study subjects. Therefore, this chapter includes the results revealed in connection with the aims and hypothesis of the study. The findings are afterwards discussed in the light of the theoretical and experimental evidence.

4.2 Analysis of Results

The results of the post test were analysed by employing the t-test formula for two independent samples to compute the t-value and then compared to the tabulated t-value which is 2.00 at 0.05 level of statistical significance when the degree of freedom is 58.

According to the scores gained by the study sample in the post test (Appendix 9), it is found out that the mean scores of the experimental group is 73.433, and of the control group is 50.1,

where as the computed t-value is 5.350 which is found out to be higher than the tabulated t- value see table (9).

This result indicates that there is a significant difference between the subjects of the experimental group and those of the control one in their achievement in grammar in the post test after applying the EEE approach on the experimental group only and in favour of the experimental group.

As a result, the null hypothesis is refused, and an alternative hypothesis is adopted and which states that there is a statistically significant difference between the experimental group, which is exposed to the proposed EEE approach in teaching L₂ Grammar, and the control group, which is not exposed to the EEE approach in their achievement in Grammar.

Table 9

The t-value of the Post - test Scores

| Group | No. | \bar{X} | S^2 | t-Value | | df | Level of significance |
|--------|-----|-----------|---------|------------|-------|----|-----------------------|
| | | | | Calculated | table | | |
| Exper. | 30 | 73.433 | 16.923 | 5.350 | 2.000 | 58 | 0.05 |
| Cont. | 30 | 50.1 | 286.392 | | | | |

4.3 Discussion of Results

The results of the present study signify that as the other approaches to TEFL do, the EEE approach integrates theory and practice into the nature of language learning since its principles are based on theoretical and experimental evidences. It has been noticed that the study sample which is eager to learn English in a way different from the daily routine of orally practiced drills. This agree with Nunan's (1991:3), idea that "an important aspect of using any approach is the development of teaching routine, materials and tasks for use in the classroom". The negative results obtained by the control group who were taught by using the AL Approach does not develop the learner's overall command of language, whereas the subjects of the experimental group who were taught by using the EEE approach innovated in this study were better at their linguistic achievement, as measured by the post test, than those of the control group who where taught by using the A.L. Approach.

Thus, it is concluded that integrative grammar in teaching English within the limits of this study yield better results in linguistic achievement than the prevailing situation as appears in the textbook. This agrees with AL- Samarri's (2002) when he used the integrative approach in teaching English for second intermediate school classes and in every activity in classroom. But his study does not yield better results in the linguistic achievement of Iraqi second learners than the conventional

audiolingual approach at least in the circumstances involved in the application of this approach for this particular study. Thus, the hypothesis of his study was rejected. While Sysoyev (1999) had the same method EEE in teaching L₂ Grammar and the method worked fairly successful with the students. They were willing to respond and participate in classroom communication. The mean score was 1.33, which signifies that the students were positive towards the EEE method. Therefore, Sysoyev's results go in line with the present study.

Chapter Five

“Conclusions, Recommendations & Suggestions for Further Studies”

5.1 Conclusions

The conclusions below are drawn in the light of the study results and the researcher's own observations throughout the present investigation:

1. There is a statistically significant difference between the experimental group which is exposed to the EEE approach in teaching Integrative L₂ Grammar, and the control one which is not exposed to this approach in their achievement on the post - test in Grammar.
2. There is a mutual interaction between the learner and the teacher throughout the class activities.
3. There is a very high motivation for the learners to express their ideas and to participate in class activities especially in Grammar when they used to be frightened in participating in front of their classmates.

4. From this study, the researcher noticed that the learner's comprehension become good rather than when using the traditional AL approach in teaching grammar. After all, this study made the learners understand the rules of the tenses.
5. The EEE approach in teaching grammar made a communication goal in classroom activities for the learners who became good communicators.

5.2 Recommendations

In the light of the findings of the present research which give evidence in support of providing fifth class students with the use of the EEE approach in teaching grammar and with their good achievement, the following recommendations are made to enrich the process of teaching and learning EFL. The recommendations are grouped in the following sections according to the elements of the teaching process involved.

5.2.1 The EFL Learner

1. School students should be provided with instruction and training of the EEE approach in language skill.
2. EFL learners must be encouraged to depend on themselves in picking out the rules of grammar and their formula, besides the help of the teacher.
3. Attention should be paid to fifth class learners in general level.

4. If we want our EFL learners to become good at grammar, we have to train them to be active listeners. Hence, teaching EEE approach in Iraq should receive parallel interest from the early stages of FL teaching.

5.2.2 The Teacher

1. Teachers of English need to be acquainted with the basic elements of this approach through special in – service training programmes to acquire sufficient knowledge and experience.
2. Teachers should be encouraged to help students learn how to organize and write their sentences in the right way and how they can pick out the right rule.
3. Teachers of English are advised to:
 1. Pay attention to the clarity of voice, the pace of delivery, and the appropriate use of the blackboard and visual aids.
 2. Make clear the organizing principles of a lesson, paying attention to transition as well as content, and making sure to emphasize relationships among related lessons.
 3. Write on the blackboard sentences and then encouraging students to pick out the rule of which tense they were taking.
 4. Give the students feedback, by saying good if the student makes the right choice.

5. Make students good communicators in classroom by encouraging them to participate actively in the activities especially in oral practice ones.

5.2.3 The Material and Textbooks

1. The EEE approach adopted in the present study can be also adopted to be taught to other EFL students since its effectiveness is proved.
2. Similar EEE courses need to be incorporated in the academic curricula of English in the Iraqi schools especially in secondary schools.
3. Systematic and graded exercises to improve the EEE approach of school students are also needed.

5.3 Suggestions for Further Research

On the basis of the findings of the present study, the following suggestions are put forward to enrich future research:

1. A study is needed to investigate the effectiveness of the EEE approach in other stages of the secondary school level.
2. The effect of the sex variable, using the EEE in TEFL on the linguistic achievement of secondary school learners needs to be investigated.

3. The effect of the EEE approach in TEFL on the linguistic achievement of college learners of English needs to be studied for different college stages.
4. Using this approach in teaching other activities and not only grammar, such as teaching reading, listening, etc... Then finding out its effect on the learners' achievement.

Appendices

Appendix 1

**University of Baghdad
College of Education/
Ibn Rushed
Department of Educational
And Psychological Sciences**

A letter to the Jury members

Dear Sir, Madam.

The researcher intends to conduct an experimental study entitled "The Impact of Integrative L₂ Grammar teaching by Exploration, Explanation and Expression Techniques on students' Achievement in Grammar".

The aim of the study is to investigate empirically the Impact of Integrative L₂ Grammar teaching by Exploration, Explanation and Expression Techniques on students' Achievement in Grammar.

As specialists in the field of teaching English, please read the items of the test and thankfully state if they are suitable for the level of 5th secondary class students to achieve its face validity. Any addition or modification will be highly regarded. This experimental is going to be carried out in two months (eight weeks/ 5 lessons per week), on 5th year secondary students, for the school year 2003-2004.

Your cooperation in this matter, which aims at developing teaching English in Iraq, will be greatly appreciated.

Thank you

**Rawa' Hafudh Majeed
M.A. Candidate**

Appendix 2

Subjects Scores in the Final Examination in English in the Fourth preparatory year (2002– 2003)

| The Experimental group | | | | The Control group | | | |
|------------------------|----------------|-----|----------------|-------------------|----------------|-----|----------------|
| No. | X ₁ | No. | X ₁ | No. | X ₂ | No. | X ₂ |
| 1 | 60 | 16 | 50 | 1 | 50 | 16 | 50 |
| 2 | 71 | 17 | 55 | 2 | 74 | 17 | 61 |
| 3 | 52 | 18 | 94 | 3 | 59 | 18 | 57 |
| 4 | 94 | 19 | 73 | 4 | 52 | 19 | 85 |
| 5 | 51 | 20 | 90 | 5 | 57 | 20 | 74 |
| 6 | 75 | 21 | 51 | 6 | 50 | 21 | 50 |
| 7 | 50 | 22 | 76 | 7 | 59 | 22 | 59 |
| 8 | 53 | 23 | 62 | 8 | 76 | 23 | 62 |
| 9 | 98 | 24 | 95 | 9 | 81 | 24 | 64 |
| 10 | 79 | 25 | 89 | 10 | 81 | 25 | 64 |
| 11 | 50 | 26 | 76 | 11 | 96 | 26 | 72 |
| 12 | 59 | 27 | 71 | 12 | 95 | 27 | 74 |
| 13 | 50 | 28 | 70 | 13 | 55 | 28 | 64 |
| 14 | 75 | 29 | 62 | 14 | 90 | 29 | 55 |
| 15 | 58 | 30 | 81 | 15 | 83 | 30 | 88 |

$$\sum X_1 = 2070$$

$$X_1^- = 69$$

$$S_1 = 15.844$$

$$S_1^2 = 251.034$$

$$\sum X_2 = 2037$$

$$X_2^- = 67.9$$

$$S_2 = 14.317$$

$$S_2^2 = 204.989$$

$$t = 0.270$$

Appendix 3

The Level of Father's Education

| Experimental group | | | | Control group | | | |
|--------------------|--------|-----|--------|---------------|--------|-----|--------|
| No. | Symbol | No. | Symbol | No. | Symbol | No. | Symbol |
| 1 | 3 | 16 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 16 | 3 |
| 2 | 4 | 17 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 17 | 4 |
| 3 | 2 | 18 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 18 | 4 |
| 4 | 3 | 19 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 19 | 1 |
| 5 | 3 | 20 | 3 | 5 | 1 | 20 | 2 |
| 6 | 1 | 21 | 1 | 6 | 3 | 21 | 2 |
| 7 | 2 | 22 | 2 | 7 | 4 | 22 | 3 |
| 8 | 3 | 23 | 4 | 8 | 4 | 23 | 3 |
| 9 | 1 | 24 | 3 | 9 | 1 | 24 | 1 |
| 10 | 4 | 25 | 4 | 10 | 3 | 25 | 4 |
| 11 | 4 | 26 | 1 | 11 | 3 | 26 | 4 |
| 12 | 3 | 27 | 2 | 12 | 4 | 27 | 1 |
| 13 | 3 | 28 | 3 | 13 | 3 | 28 | 2 |
| 14 | 4 | 29 | 3 | 14 | 4 | 29 | 2 |
| 15 | 1 | 30 | 4 | 15 | 4 | 30 | 3 |

$$X^2 = \sum \frac{(O - E)^2}{E}$$

$$X^2 = 0.38$$

Appendix 4

The Level of Mother's Education

| Experimental group | | | | Control group | | | |
|--------------------|--------|-----|--------|---------------|--------|-----|--------|
| No. | Symbol | No. | Symbol | No. | Symbol | No. | Symbol |
| 1 | 2 | 16 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 16 | 1 |
| 2 | 3 | 17 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 17 | 1 |
| 3 | 3 | 18 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 18 | 3 |
| 4 | 4 | 19 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 19 | 3 |
| 5 | 3 | 20 | 4 | 5 | 2 | 20 | 2 |
| 6 | 2 | 21 | 2 | 6 | 4 | 21 | 1 |
| 7 | 1 | 22 | 4 | 7 | 2 | 22 | 1 |
| 8 | 2 | 23 | 2 | 8 | 3 | 23 | 1 |
| 9 | 2 | 24 | 3 | 9 | 4 | 24 | 2 |
| 10 | 3 | 25 | 3 | 10 | 4 | 25 | 2 |
| 11 | 3 | 26 | 4 | 11 | 4 | 26 | 2 |
| 12 | 2 | 27 | 3 | 12 | 3 | 27 | 1 |
| 13 | 4 | 28 | 1 | 13 | 4 | 28 | 2 |
| 14 | 4 | 29 | 1 | 14 | 1 | 29 | 1 |
| 15 | 3 | 30 | 2 | 15 | 2 | 30 | 2 |

$$X^2 = \sum \frac{(O - E)^2}{E}$$

$$X^2 = 1.256$$

11. You went out ----- the rain stopped .
a. or b. after c. whether d. Although
12. ----- Richard was not trained as a teacher , he will teach this year.
a. Therefore b. although c. because d. until.
13. Our house is ----- the two houses .
a. among b. under c. between d. over .
14. This building is twenty meters long . It's twenty meters in -----.
a. Length b. width c. height d. weight .
15. My dress is pretty but Layla's dress is -----.
a. the Prettiest b. prettier c. more pretty d. most pretty .
16. Baghdad is the ----- cities in the Middle East .
a. large b. larger c. largest d. more large .
17. The party will be -----.
a. Yesterday b. two days ago c. tomorrow d. now .
18. ----- meat is in the refrigerator?
a. How many b. How long c. How far . d. How much .
19. Street sweepers ----- the streets every morning .
a. sweeps b. sweeping c. sweep d. swept
20. Please , look -----the sleeping babies while I'm a way.
a. about b. after c. over d. for .

Appendix 6

Subjects scores in the Pre – test

| Experimental group | | | | Control group | | | |
|--------------------|----------------|-----|----------------|---------------|----------------|-----|----------------|
| No. | X ₁ | No. | X ₁ | No. | X ₂ | No. | X ₂ |
| 1 | 80 | 16 | 65 | 1 | 60 | 16 | 75 |
| 2 | 80 | 17 | 60 | 2 | 45 | 17 | 85 |
| 3 | 65 | 18 | 75 | 3 | 60 | 18 | 50 |
| 4 | 60 | 19 | 55 | 4 | 50 | 19 | 55 |
| 5 | 75 | 20 | 65 | 5 | 70 | 20 | 70 |
| 6 | 65 | 21 | 45 | 6 | 45 | 21 | 45 |
| 7 | 55 | 22 | 65 | 7 | 65 | 22 | 65 |
| 8 | 55 | 23 | 70 | 8 | 80 | 23 | 35 |
| 9 | 55 | 24 | 45 | 9 | 65 | 24 | 45 |
| 10 | 60 | 25 | 35 | 10 | 65 | 25 | 35 |
| 11 | 85 | 26 | 35 | 11 | 55 | 26 | 35 |
| 12 | 80 | 27 | 40 | 12 | 55 | 27 | 40 |
| 13 | 70 | 28 | 40 | 13 | 55 | 28 | 35 |
| 14 | 60 | 29 | 40 | 14 | 35 | 29 | 35 |
| 15 | 55 | 30 | 35 | 15 | 90 | 30 | 45 |

$$\sum X_1 = 1770$$

$$X_1^- = 59$$

$$S_1 = 14.645$$

$$S_1^2 = 214.482$$

$$\sum X_2 = 1645$$

$$X_2^- = 54.83$$

$$S_1 = 16.582$$

$$S_2^2 = 274.971$$

$$t = 0.406$$

Appendix 7

A Model Daily Plan Lesson for the Experimental Group

This is one sample of the daily lesson plan for the 5th secondary class that will be exposed to the sample of the study by using the EEE method in teaching L₂ Grammar (present simple & present continuous tense).

The researcher gives the pupils in 5th secondary class (experimental group) several sentences. After that, they will read and try to explore the rule that the sentences have, and the adverbs or adverbial phrases that we can use with this tense. Also the sensation, emotion, and thinking verbs are not used in the continuous tense.

The sentences are:

- 1- Firas is reading a newspaper at the moment.
- 2- I'm standing near the door.
- 3- We can see you now.
- 4- I feel quite well today.
- 5- She is wearing a new coat today.
- 6- They are studying English now.
- 7- I hear you now.
- 8- Tom is not getting his salary tomorrow.

Then the researcher explains what are the present continuous tense and the adverbials that are used with. The students share with her the explaining of the subject.

After that, the researcher gives them the change to express the subject with sentences and she will correct the mistakes they will make. Finally, the researcher should notice any point in the textbook that is related to it, e.g., there is a situation in (3.9) which is very useful for the students because it connects from with meaning.

Appendix 8

The Post – test

Post – test : - (The production test)

Q1: *Put the verbs in the right tenses (present simple or present continuous).*

1. She (go) to school everyday except Friday.
2. It (rain) now.
3. The teacher (point) at the blackboard when he (want) to explain something.
4. My brother always (drive) his car carefully.
5. Lazy students never (work) hard.
6. Right now I (look) around the classroom.
7. Diane (wash) her hair every other day or so.
8. Mike is a student, but he (go, not) to school right now because it's summer.
9. She (look) cold . I'll lend her my coat.
10. John and Mary (talk) on the phone at this moment.
11. I need an umbrella because it (rain).
12. I (have) only a dollar right now.
13. Most animals (kill) only for food.
14. I can't afford that ring. It (cost) too much.
15. There's a book on my desk, but it (belong, not) to me.

Q2: *Choose the correct answer:-* (The recognition test)

1. The telephone Now.
 - a. rang
 - b. ring
 - c. rang
 - d. is ringing

2. People Thin clothes in summer.
 - a. wear
 - b. wears
 - c. to wear
 - d. are wearing

3. The milkman To our house every morning.
a. come c. to come
b. comes d. coming
4. He usually To the office by bus.
a. go c. have gone
b. Is going d. goes.
5. What is the lawyer doing now? He The papers.
a. will study c. is studying
b. studies b. has studied
6. The class usually at eight o'clock .
a. is beginning c. began
b. begin d. begins
7. The train for Mosul now.
a. leaves c. left
b. is leaving d. leave
8. Mr. Brown normally his shop at night.
a. open c. opens
b. is opening d. opened
9. They to the seaside every summer.
a. are going c. goes
b. go d. went
10. She her lunch at home.
a. take c. is taking
b. takes d. took
11. Mother the dishes now.
a. washes c. washed
b. is washing d. wash

12. This o'clock every hour.
a. strikes c. is striking
b. strike d. stroke
13. He his old car at the moment.
a. sell c. is selling
b. sells d. sold
14. The boys in the youth center afternoon.
a. plays c. played
b. are playing d. play

Appendix 9

Subjects' Scores in the Post – test

| The Experimental group | | | | The Control group | | | |
|------------------------|----------------|-----|----------------|-------------------|----------------|-----|----------------|
| No. | X ₁ | No. | X ₁ | No. | X ₂ | No. | X ₂ |
| 1 | 70 | 16 | 40 | 1 | 30 | 16 | 42 |
| 2 | 72 | 17 | 78 | 2 | 50 | 17 | 24 |
| 3 | 70 | 18 | 60 | 3 | 54 | 18 | 40 |
| 4 | 80 | 19 | 74 | 4 | 52 | 19 | 50 |
| 5 | 70 | 20 | 90 | 5 | 48 | 20 | 52 |
| 6 | 74 | 21 | 88 | 6 | 30 | 21 | 46 |
| 7 | 40 | 22 | 94 | 7 | 60 | 22 | 58 |
| 8 | 82 | 23 | 96 | 8 | 50 | 23 | 30 |
| 9 | 85 | 24 | 92 | 9 | 56 | 24 | 36 |
| 10 | 80 | 25 | 74 | 10 | 88 | 25 | 76 |
| 11 | 45 | 26 | 76 | 11 | 90 | 26 | 52 |
| 12 | 35 | 27 | 80 | 12 | 40 | 27 | 52 |
| 13 | 40 | 28 | 76 | 13 | 26 | 28 | 62 |
| 14 | 70 | 29 | 86 | 14 | 65 | 29 | 30 |
| 15 | 76 | 30 | 90 | 15 | 64 | 30 | 50 |

$$\sum X_1 = 2203$$

$$X_1^- = 73.433$$

$$S^2 = 16.923$$

$$\sum X_2 = 1503$$

$$X_2^- = 50.1$$

$$S^2 = 286.392$$

$$t = 5.350$$

Appendix 10

The Difficulty Level and the Discrimination Power of the Written Post – test Items

| Q. 1 | N. co. ans. up | N. co. ans. Low | D. | Dis. |
|-------------|----------------|-----------------|------|------|
| 1 | 45 | 19 | 0.64 | 0.52 |
| 2 | 34 | 13 | 0.47 | 0.42 |
| 3 | 41 | 15 | 0.56 | 0.52 |
| 4 | 30 | 12 | 0.42 | 0.36 |
| 5 | 42 | 25 | 0.67 | 0.34 |
| 6 | 40 | 23 | 0.63 | 0.34 |
| 7 | 28 | 18 | 0.46 | 0.20 |
| 8 | 24 | 8 | 0.32 | 0.32 |
| 9 | 30 | 17 | 0.47 | 0.26 |
| 10 | 20 | 7 | 0.27 | 0.26 |
| 11 | 35 | 10 | 0.45 | 0.50 |
| 12 | 40 | 16 | 0.56 | 0.48 |
| 13 | 23 | 20 | 0.43 | 0.60 |
| 14 | 34 | 17 | 0.51 | 0.34 |
| 15 | 33 | 7 | 0.40 | 0.52 |
| 16 | 46 | 12 | 0.58 | 0.68 |
| 17 | 35 | 19 | 0.54 | 0.32 |
| 18 | 25 | 6 | 0.31 | 0.38 |
| 19 | 34 | 13 | 0.47 | 0.42 |
| 20 | 34 | 14 | 0.48 | 0.40 |
| Q. 2 | | | | |
| 1 | 41 | 19 | 0.60 | 0.44 |
| 2 | 37 | 18 | 0.55 | 0.38 |
| 3 | 38 | 27 | 0.65 | 0.22 |
| 4 | 38 | 12 | 0.50 | 0.52 |
| 5 | 30 | 11 | 0.41 | 0.38 |
| 6 | 30 | 10 | 0.40 | 0.40 |
| 7 | 39 | 29 | 0.68 | 0.20 |
| 8 | 28 | 3 | 0.31 | 0.50 |
| 9 | 29 | 12 | 0.41 | 0.34 |
| 10 | 20 | 11 | 0.31 | 0.18 |
| 11 | 31 | 19 | 0.51 | 0.24 |
| 12 | 38 | 31 | 0.69 | 0.14 |
| 13 | 28 | 10 | 0.38 | 0.36 |
| 14 | 39 | 27 | 0.66 | 0.24 |
| 15 | 30 | 8 | 0.38 | 0.44 |
| 16 | 30 | 10 | 0.40 | 0.40 |
| 17 | 22 | 12 | 0.34 | 0.20 |
| 18 | 32 | 14 | 0.46 | 0.36 |
| 19 | 41 | 28 | 0.69 | 0.26 |
| 20 | 32 | 23 | 0.55 | 0.18 |

Bibliography

A Committee in the Ministry of Education, (1990). "The New Course for Iraq": *Book VII*: The pupil's Book. Seventh Revised Edition.

A Committee in the Ministry of Education, (1994). "The New English Course for Iraq": *Book VII*. The Teacher's Guide. Third Revised Edition.

Alderson, J. C., C. Capham and D. Wall (1995) *Language Test Construction and Evaluation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

AL-Mutawa, Najat and Taiseer Kailani, (1989) *Methods of Teaching English to Arab students*. Longman.

Al – Zuba'i and Al – Ghannam (1981) *Methods of Research in Education*. University of Baghdad Press. (in Arabic).

Appel, G., and J. Lantolf, (1994). "Negative feedback on regulation and second language learning in the zone of proximal development ". *The Modern Language Journal* 78(4) 465-83.

- Baron, Denis and H. W. Bernard (1958) *Evaluation Techniques for Classroom Teachers*. New York: Mc Graw – Hill Book Company.
- Benson, M.J. (1991). "Attitudes and motivation towards English": A survey of Japanese freshmen. *RELC Journal*, 22 (1), 34-48.
- Bertta , A.& Davies , A. (1985) Evalation of the Bangalore project : *ELT Journal* 39:121-7.
- Best, John W. (1981) *Research in Education* (4th Ed). New Jersey: Prentice –Hall, Inc.
- Brown, H. Douglas (1987). "*Principles of Language and Teaching*". Prentice – Hall, Inc., Englewood CLIFFS, New Jersey.
- Candlin, Christopher N. (1984)."Teacher-centered training: costing the process". In Quirk, Randolph and Widdowson, H.G. (Eds) *English in the world: learning the language and literatures*. Cambridge University Press. PP.107-20.

Candlin, C.N., Jack Richard, John Platt, and Heidi Platt,
Consultant Prof. (1992) *Language Teaching and
Applied Linguistics*. Longman.

Celce-Murcia, M., Z., Dornyei, and S. Thurrell, 1997. "Direct
Approaches in L2 Instruction: A Turing Point in
Communicative Language Teaching"? *TESOL
Quarterly*, 31: 141-152.

Chomsky (1965). *Aspects of the Theory of Syntax*. Cambridge:
MIT Press.

Christensen, Larry B. (1980) *Experimental Methodology*. (2nd
Ed). Boston: Allen and Bacon, Inc.

Crookes, G., & R.W. Schmidt (1991). "Motivation": *Reopening
the research agenda language learning*, 41(4), 469-
512.

Dalen, D.B. Van (1962) *Understanding Educational Research:
An Introduction*. (3rd Ed), New York: Mc Graw- Hill
Book Company.

Davies, A., A., Brown, C., Elder, K., Hill, T. Lumley, and
McNamara. (1997). *Dictionary of language Testing*.
Cambridge: University of Cambridge.

_____, Cathie Elder, Kathryn Hill, Tom Lumley, and Tim
McNamara (1999). Studies in Language Testing 7.
Dictionary of Language testing. University of
Cambridge.

_____ (1997) *SLA research and Language Teaching*.
Oxford. Oxford University Press.

_____, (1997). *The study of second language acquisition*.
Oxford University Press.

Daniels , H.S. Zemel man and M.Bizar (1999) "*Whole
Language works : Sixty years of research* "
Educational Leader ship, October :32-27.

Dwyer, Carol A. (1982) "Achievement Testing". *In
Encyclopedia of Educational Research*, Vol.1, edited
by H.E. Mitzel, 5th ed. New York: The Free Press,
Macmillan publishing Co., Ine.

Ebell, Robert L. (1972) *Essentials of Educational Measurement*. New Jersey: Prentice – Hall, Inc.

Ellis, R. (1982) , Informal and formal approaches to communicative Language Teaching . *ELT Journal* , 36,73-81.

Falk, J. (1978). *Linguistics and Language: A survey of basic concepts and implications* (2nd ed.). John Wiley and Sons.

Finnegan. (1999), *Language: Its structure and use* (3rd Ed.). Harcourt Brace.

Finocchiaro, M., and C. Brumfit. (1983). *The Functional-Notional Approach from Theory to Practice*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Frank, C. and M., Rinvoluceri, (1987), *Grammar in Action*, Hemel Hempstead: prentice Hall.

Freeman, Diane Larsen (1986). "*Techniques and Principles in Language Teaching*". Oxford University Press.

Glass, G.V., and J.C. Stanley. (1970) *Statistical Methods in Education and Psychology*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

_____, (1975). *Learning How to Mean: Explorations in the Development of Language*. London: Edward Arnold.

_____, (1970), "Language Structure and Language function". Inj. Lyons(ed.), *New Horizons in Linguistics*. Harmondsworth:penguin. 140-465.

_____, McIntosh. & Stevens. (1964), *the Linguists Sciences and Language Teaching*, London: Longman.

Good, Carter (1973), *Dictionary of Education*. NewYork: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Ine.

Gronlund, Norman E. (1965) *Measurement and Evaluation in Teaching*. New York: The Macmillan Co.

Halliday, M. A. K. (1973), *Explorations in the Functions of Language*. London: Edward Arnold.

Harmar, Jeremy (2000). "*How to Teach English*". Longman.

- Harris, David P. (1969) *Testing English as a Second Language*. New York: Mc Graw – Hill Book Company.
- Heaton, J.B. (1975) *Writing English Language Tests*. London: Longman Group Ltd.
- Hudson, G. (2000). *Essential introductory linguistics* Blackwell Publishers.
- Hymes, D. 1972. *On Communicative Competence*. In J.B. Pride and J. Holmes (eds.), *Sociolinguistics*. Harmondsworth:
- Internet, WWW. Uwe Multhaup. *Model 2*, 2002.
- Jacqueline Norris –Holt. *The Internet TESL Journal*, Vol, No. 6, June 2001. Motivation as a Contributing Factor in Second Language Acquisition.
- Kelly, L.G. (1969), *25 Centuries of Language Teaching*. Rowley, Mass: Newbury house.
- Krashen S. 1981. *Second Language acquisition and second language learning*. Oxford: Pergamon

- _____, 1985. *The Input Hypothesis: issues and applications*.
New York: Longman.
- Lantolf, J., Pavlenko, A. 1995. Sociocultural theory and second language acquisition. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics* 15: 108 – 24.
- Lewin , Miriam (1979) *Understanding psychological Research*
.New york : John Wiley and Sons. .
- Lightbown, P.M. (1998). "*The importance of timing on focus on form*". In C. Doughty & J. Williams (Eds.), *Focus on form in classroom second language acquisition* (pp.177-196).Cambridge: Cambridge University press.
- Long, M.H., & G. Crookes, (1992). Three approaches to task-based syllabus design. *TESOL Quarterly*, 26, 27-56
- Mckay, S. (1987). *Teaching Grammar: Form, Function and Technique*. Hemel Hempstead: Prentice Hall.
- Mehrens, W.A. and I.J Lehman. (1991). *Measurement and Evaluation in Education and Psychology*. 4th Ed.
New York: Holt Rinehart and Winston, Inc.

_____, (1991) *Language Teaching Methodology*.

Prentice Hall International (UK) Ltd.

Minium, E.W., R.Clarke and T.Coladarci. (1999). *Elements of Statistical Reasoning* .2nd ed. New York: John Wiley Sons.

Murkowska, Anna,(2000). *Grammar as choice*. An Internet Article.

Musumeci, D. 1997. *Breaking the tradition: an exploration of the historical relationship between theory and practice in second language teaching* .N.Y: McGraw – Hill.

Nassaji, Hossein, (1999). "Towards Integrating Form-focused Instruction and Communicative Interaction in the second language classroo: some pedagogical possibilities" published in the *Canadian language-Volume 55*, No.3, March/mars 1999.

Nobuyoshi , J. & Ellis , R. (1993) Focused communication tasks and second Language acquisition: *ELT Journal* , 47,203-210.

Nunan, David, (1989) *Designing tasks for the communicative classroom* Cambridge University press.

Page, T.G, J.B Thomas , and A.R. Marchall .(1980)
International dictionary of Education printed in great
Brittan .

Palmer, H.E. (1917). *The Scientific Study and Teaching of Languages*. Reprinted: London: Oxford University Press, 1968.

_____. (1921), *Principles of Language Study*, New York:
World Book Co.

Pica, T., R., Kanagy, & J. Falodun, (1993). "Choosing and using communicative tasks for second language instruction".
In G. Crookes & S.M. Gass (Eds.), *Tasks and language learning: Integrating theory and practice*, (pp.9-34). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Quirk, Randolph and Sidney Greenbaum. (1973). *A University Grammar of English*. Longmam.

_____, (2001). *Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching*. second Edition Cambridge University press.

Remmers, H. H., N. L. Gage and J. F. Rummel (1965) *A Practical Introduction to Measurement and Evaluation (2nd Ed)*. New York: Harper and Row Publishers.

Richards Jack C. & Theodore S. Rodgers , (1998) *Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching* , Fourteenth printing Cambridge University press .

Rose , C.C. and J.C . Stanley (1954) *Measurement in Today's Schools* (3rd ed .) . New Jersey : Prentice – Hall , Inc.

Rutherfordl W. (1987). *Second Language Grammar; Learning and Teaching*. London: Longman.

Sesnan, Barry (1997) *How to Teach English* . Oxford : oxford University .

Skehan, P. (1996) "A framework for the implementation of task-based instruction". *Applied Linguistics*, Vol. 17, No. 1: 38-62.

Smith, Fred M. and S. Adams (1966) *Educational Measurement for the Classroom Teacher*. New York: Harper and Row Publishers.

Spada, N., and P. Lightbown, (1993). "Instruction and the development of questions in the L₂ classroom". *Studies in second Language Acquisition*, 15: 205-224.

Swain, M. (1985). "Communicative Competence: some roles for comprehensible input and comprehensible output in its development". IS. Gass and C. Madden (Eds) *Input in Second Language Acquisition*, Rowley, Mass: Newbury House.

Sysoyev, Pavel V. (1999) "Integrative L2 Grammar Teaching", *The Internet TESL Journal*, Vol.V,No. 6, June 1999.<http://iteslj.org/>

Taylor, D.M., R., Meynard, & E Rheault, (1977). "Threat to ethnic identity and second-language learning". In H. Giles, *Language, ethnicity and intergroup relations* (pp.99-118). Academic press.

- Trim, J.L.M. (1985). Comments on "A view from teacher in – service education and training" by Christopher Edelhoff. In Quirk, Randolph and Widdowson, H.G. (Eds) *English in the world: learning the language and literatures*. Cambridge University Press. 143-5.
- Ur, P. (1988). *Grammar Practice Activities*, Cambridge University Press.
- Van EK, J., and L. G. Alexander. (1980) *Threshold Level English*. Oxford: Pregamon.
- VanPatten, B. (1994). "Evaluating the role of consciousness in second language acquisition: Terms, linguistic features & research methodology". In J.H. Hulstijn & R. Schmidt (Eds.), *Consciousness in second language learning* (pp.27-36). Amsterdam: Association Internationale de Linguistique Appliqu'ee.
- Widdowson , H.G .(1978) *Teaching Language as commutation*. Oxford : Oxford University press.
- Wilkins. D.A. (1972). *Linguistics in Language teaching*. Edward Arnold, London.

_____(1976), *National Syllabuses*, Oxford: Oxford
University Press.